

ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

# BULLETIN

---

VOL. XIII

MAY, 1927

No. 3

---

The Relations  
Between Faculty and Students

The Teaching of Art  
in American Colleges

Edited by

ROBERT L. KELLY  
Secretary of the Association

Published by

THE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN COLLEGES

Lime & Green Sts., Lancaster, Pa.

*Editorial Offices*

111 Fifth Avenue, New York, N. Y.

February, April, May and November

Annual Subscription, \$3.00

Entered as second class matter, March 15, 1926, at the post office at  
Lancaster, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.  
Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in  
Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized May 13, 1922.

OFFICERS OF THE ASSOCIATION  
FOR 1927-28

**PRESIDENT:**

President Lucia R. Briggs, Milwaukee-Downer College.

**VICE-PRESIDENT:**

President Arlo A. Brown, University of Chattanooga.

**SECRETARY:**

Dr. Robert L. Kelly, New York City.

**TREASURER:**

President Bernard I. Bell, St. Stephen's College.

**ADDITIONAL MEMBERS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE:**

Dean Herbert E. Hawkes, Columbia University.

President Harry M. Crooks, Alma College.

FORMER PRESIDENTS

1915 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College;  
*constitution adopted.*

1915-16 President Robert L. Kelly, Earlham College.

1916-17 President Henry Churchill King, Oberlin College.

1917-18 President John S. Nollen, Lake Forest College,  
*absent overseas.*

President Hill M. Bell,\* Drake University, Vice-  
*President, presiding.*

1918-19 President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College.

1919-20 President William A. Shanklin,\* Wesleyan Uni-  
versity.

1920-21 President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College.

1921-22 President Clark W. Chamberlain, Denison Uni-  
versity.

1922-23 President Charles A. Richmond, Union College,  
*absent in Europe.*

President Samuel Plantz,\* Lawrence College,  
*Vice-President, presiding.*

1923-24 President Harry M. Gage, Coe College.

1924-25 Chancellor J. H. Kirkland, Vanderbilt Univer-  
sity.

1925-26 President Frank Aydelotte, Swarthmore College.

1926-27 Dean John R. Effinger, University of Michigan.

\* Deceased.

**REPRESENTATION ON STANDING COMMITTEES AND COMMISSIONS**

**AMERICAN COUNCIL ON EDUCATION:**

President W. D. Scott, Northwestern University (one year).  
Chancellor Samuel P. Capen, University of Buffalo (two years).  
President Guy E. Snavely, Birmingham Southern College (three years).

**NATIONAL RESEARCH COUNCIL:**

Dean Luther P. Eisenhardt, Princeton University (two years).

**COMMISSION ON ACADEMIC FREEDOM AND ACADEMIC TENURE:**

President William W. Boyd, Western College, *Chairman*.  
Secretary Clyde Furst, The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.  
President William M. Lewis, George Washington University.  
Professor Leon B. Richardson, Dartmouth College.  
President Allan Hoben, Kalamazoo College.

**COMMISSION ON COLLEGE ARCHITECTURE AND COLLEGE INSTRUCTION IN FINE ARTS:**

President Donald J. Cowling, Carleton College, *Chairman*.  
President R. M. Hughes, Miami University.  
President F. P. Keppel, The Carnegie Corporation.  
President Kerr D. Macmillan, Wells College.  
President Frederick C. Ferry, Hamilton College.

## COMMISSION ON COLLEGE ATHLETICS:

Dean John S. Nollen, Grinnell College, *Chairman.*  
Dean Frank W. Nicolson, Wesleyan University.  
Professor Michael J. Ahern, St. Joseph's College.  
Dean Theodore H. Jack, Emory University.  
Secretary Frank D. Fackenthal, Columbia University.

## COMMISSION ON COLLEGE PERSONNEL TECHNIQUE:

Director Adam Leroy Jones, Columbia University,  
*Chairman.*  
President Louis B. Hopkins, Wabash College.  
Dean Raymond Walters, Swarthmore College.  
Secretary Frances L. Knapp, Wellesley College.  
Director Radcliffe Hermance, Princeton University.

## COMMISSION ON THE COST OF COLLEGE EDUCATION:

Professor Floyd W. Reeves, University of Kentucky,  
*Chairman.*  
President Joseph H. Apple, Hood College.  
President George F. Zook, University of Akron.  
Dr. Arthur T. Klein, United States Bureau of Education.  
Comptroller George C. Wintringer, Princeton University.

## COMMISSION ON EDUCATIONAL SURVEYS:

Director Charles R. Mann, American Council on Education,  
*Chairman.*  
Chancellor Samuel P. Capen, University of Buffalo.  
Miss Eleanore Boswell, American Association of University Women.

**COMMISSION ON ENLISTMENT AND TRAINING OF COLLEGE  
TEACHERS:**

Dean Otis E. Randall, Brown University, *Chairman.*  
President James L. McConaughy, Wesleyan University.  
Dean Marshall S. Brown, New York University.  
Dean Charles L. Raper, Syracuse University.  
President W. P. Few, Duke University.

**COMMISSION ON FACULTY AND STUDENT SCHOLARSHIP:**

President Edward S. Parsons, Marietta College, *Chair-  
man.*  
Dean C. Mildred Thompson, Vassar College.  
Dean Julian Park, University of Buffalo.  
President Kenneth C. M. Sills, Bowdoin College.  
Vice-Rector Edward A. Pace, The Catholic University  
of America.

**COMMISSION ON ORGANIZATION OF THE COLLEGE CURRICU-  
LUM:**

President Arthur E. Morgan, Antioch College.  
President John D. Finlayson, University of Wichita.  
President Meta Glass, Sweet Briar College.  
Professor W. O. Allen, Lafayette College.

**COMMISSION ON PERMANENT AND TRUST FUNDS:**

Mr. Trevor Arnett, New York City, *Chairman.*  
Comptroller Raymond N. Ball, University of Rochester.  
Treasurer John I. Pasek, Huron College.  
President W. J. Hutchins, Berea College.  
Mr. J. B. Northeott, Assistant to the President, Coe  
College.  
Dr. A. W. Anthony, Trustee, Bates College.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

The Teaching of the Fine Arts, <i>Robert L. Kelly</i> .....	209
Ideals for an Effective College, <i>Kerr D. Macmillan</i> .....	210
The Relations Between Faculty and Students, <i>Clarence C. Little</i> .....	219
Student Relations in a College of Five Hundred Students, <i>Louis B. Hopkins</i> .....	230
The Small College and Personnel Procedure, <i>Raymond Walters</i> .....	236
Personnel Technique in the Handling of Freshmen, <i>Adam Leroy Jones</i> .....	244
College Athletics: An Opinion, <i>John S. Nollen</i> .....	258
The Place of Art in the Liberal College, <i>Lura Beam</i> .....	265
Appendix .....	290

## THE TEACHING OF THE FINE ARTS

ROBERT L. KELLY

In this issue of the BULLETIN the Proceedings of the Thirteenth Annual Meeting are concluded, and in addition certain facts and tentative conclusions concerning the teaching of art in American colleges are presented by Miss Lura Beam, for several years an Associate Secretary in the office of the Association of American Colleges and the Council of Church Boards of Education.

In the first section of Miss Beam's article a summary is given of a statistical study of the extent to which some form of art teaching was reported by a large number of colleges in 1925. The facts speak for themselves.

In the second section, certain possible syntheses are suggested of data secured through an intensive study of a few institutions. These institutions are H. Sophie Newcomb College, the University of Chicago, Mills College, the University of Washington, Oberlin, Smith and Dartmouth Colleges.

The members of the Association will recall that this intensive study was made possible through a subvention from the Carnegie Corporation. Miss Beam spent more than a year in the field. Her report on each institution has been submitted for the correction of possible errors of fact to the president and the head of the department of art of each institution. The reports are technical and comprehensive and represent the point of view of one well qualified critic. For the most part they have had the cordial approval of the institutions concerned. In order that administrators and students of the teaching of the Fine Arts among the members of the Association may have access to these studies a number of loan copies are being prepared and will be available upon application. Those interested will communicate directly with the office of the Association of American Colleges, 111 Fifth Avenue, New York City.

## IDEALS FOR AN EFFECTIVE COLLEGE

PRESIDENT KERR D. MACMILLAN, Wells College

*Mr. President, Ladies and Gentlemen:* I cannot explain how cramped I have felt all evening sandwiched between a dean and a president of one of our hugest institutions, I representing one of the very least and very smallest. I am going to take my revenge on them and perhaps on some of the rest of you by holding up the ideals of a small institution, not necessarily a small college, but a small institution.

I am announced to speak on "The Program for the Effective College." When the title came to me first the word "program" was not there; there was simply The Effective College to think about, and I could think much more widely than I can with the restricting idea of a program. I have no program for an effective college, and were I to attempt even to outline one, it would keep us all here until the day dawn. But I would like to make one or two suggestions that I think are practical in our present situation.

I, too, must pay my respects to Mark Hopkins on one end of a log and James Garfield on the other. But that is not the kind of college that I have in mind, not even though they are sitting on a mahogany log. I am not thinking of the exceptional teacher and the exceptional student and exceptional equipment. What I have to say will apply equally well to any college, perhaps not to one that is given entirely to vocational and professional work where much insistence must be laid upon the content of the courses. I have, of course, my own college chiefly in mind, and the ideal that I have for it cannot differ very much from the ideal which you have for your own colleges.

I would like to see our girls go out trained to think steadily and carefully on any problem that is brought before them, trained to do this habitually, trained in a double way, that is to say both in the accurate, logical thinking which we have inherited from Greece, and also with something of that humility and sense of the rights of others and of the wrong in ourselves which we have inherited from Palestine. A combination of those two seems to me to be a good enough description of what we are trying to do for our young men and young women.

Now we have the colleges. They are perhaps not perfect in their equipment, but a thing may be very perfect and not function properly. A big gun, for instance, may be made of the very finest material and guaranteed 100 per cent. effective if used properly, and yet be absolutely useless and even harmful if not used correctly. I fear that there may be something wrong in our colleges, to continue the simile, both in the aiming and in the loading. I am afraid that we do not hit our students, and that when we do by chance hit them they don't feel the effects, they are hardly conscious that they have been hit.

Perhaps we may be excused for not hitting our students because they are scattered so much all over the campus, in the fraternity houses, in the literary societies, the debating societies, the editorial rooms of the college papers and the college journals, on the athletic field, in the bleachers. Our modern undergraduate is a very dispersed young man. If I were perfectly sure that everyone within hearing had had the same classical training that I have had, I would say he is a dissipated young man, not using the word in a modern sense, but in its original meaning; he is scattered; he is almost scrambled, though I don't think he is dissipated in the way we use the word to-day. It is hard to reach him. In fact, we have to manufacture quite a number of administrative committees and machines in order to see him at all. And not only that, but he is lost to himself, and when a young man is lost to himself, he is very lost indeed. One who is lost in the crowd is lost to himself.

What is the cure? And this is where I come to the small institution. The first thing that we should do to bring the individual up out of the crowd where he is submerged and in which he cannot find himself is to put him in a group where he will feel at home. That group must consist of no more than about 200. That is psychological and has been proven by experiment both on this side and on the other side of the water. You cannot put young men, young women, into a group much larger than that and have them fairly soon know every member, and, what is of still more consequence, have them feel that everyone knows them. Such a group with such a common consciousness cannot exceed 200 by very much.

Then, having a group of 200, you put them in a common home which has also room in it for a resident dean and, if you like, room also for resident members of the faculty. And with this the whole thing is done, because that is their home, and wherever there is a home there is an *esprit de corps*, and where there is a proper *esprit de corps* a group of 200 boys or girls can be handled as one.

You want to know what will be the advantage of such a small group. In the first place—I mention this first because I am less interested in it and am afraid if I don't mention it first I will forget it at the end—it will pay. You will be running a boarding house and you can make the boarding house pay. But that is a very wrong way in which to approach the problem of higher education.

The chief thing about it is, as I said before, that there will be an *esprit de corps* and that this can be acted upon by the college as a college for the purposes for which the college exists. A body of 200 can be observed, regulated and guided in a way that you cannot now guide individuals scattered as they are all over the campus. Also a group of that number will very quickly assimilate one-third their own number. That is about the proportion that will come in as freshmen every year. Incidentally, I should mention, this group of 200 should have a proper proportion of se-

niors, juniors, sophomores and freshmen, the largest number being freshmen, naturally. The freshmen will be assimilated into the college or home life before Christmas, certainly before the end of one year.

Another thing, a group of this kind will effectively assimilate foreigners. I invite you to consider how the English handled the Rhodes scholars in Oxford University. They thought about it long and carefully. They decided the best way to get hold of these foreigners was to distribute them as thinly as possible among the many small colleges that they have in Oxford—the average size of the Oxford college being less than 200. You know what the result has been. Every one of our American Rhodes scholars has come back with an English accent and some of them even have the Oxford gobble.

We have a similar experiment going on in New York City in the International House which the generosity of Mr. John D. Rockefeller, Jr., made possible, where the foreigners can be brought together (I think I am right in describing it this way; Dean Hawkes will correct me if I am wrong), live together, mingle together, and be brought intimately into touch with a few outstanding American students and members of the faculty. Probably it is the best that could be done under the circumstances, but to my mind the English method is far better, far more effective, and has already proved its effectiveness. I doubt if the International House can yet be said to have done that much.

In a group such as I have in mind, the best opinion will dominate. I suppose that most of you come from colleges where the best element of the student body is represented by the American stock. And you say to yourselves that you wish you could bring all of that stock together and bring the force of their personality to bear upon the persons and opinions of the others who are not yet used to our morals and institutions. Well, if you will divide them into groups of this kind, you will get that effect and with very

little interference on the part of the administration; the students themselves will take care of it. We can be sufficiently sure of our traditions and our American stock to feel that our boys and girls are quite able to hold their own against all this present invasion from overseas.

Again the college home solves the freshman problem to a great extent. The freshman comes up to college just at the time when he is impatient of authority, impatient of the authority of parents and of teachers in the high school, and without any proper conception of the deference that should be paid to a college president, a college dean or the members of the faculty. But he is also at that time in the hero-worshipping stage, and the hero he worships is the member of the senior class. If you group them together in the way I advise, the freshman will immediately be brought into contact with the whole body of seniors living in his group and will not dare do anything which the seniors think improper. He will soon be knocked into shape by his contact with the seniors, juniors and sophomores.

You will not be troubled with the problem of fraternities. The fraternities are a very good thing. They are doing what the college should have done long ago. They are making homes for their men to live in, and therefore around the fraternities gathers the love of the members as the love of the students does not gather around the college. A fraternity man thinks first of his fraternity and next of his college or his university. The fraternities have this *esprit de corps* that you can get in a small college or institution of 200, and the reason is that they have the members in the home. They make them all write Christmas cards to all the others. They make them all take out insurance in favor of the fraternity. They make them learn all the names of the great men that ever belonged to the fraternity, (I am not a fraternity man myself, but I have heard about this kind of thing). They make them learn all the names of the chapters from the very beginning

right down to modern times, and recite them before they are formally initiated.

What college would dare to handle its freshmen in that way? If we had some means of handling them in that way we would gain their loyalty, which now goes to the fraternity, and we would create an *esprit de corps* which we do not now have in our student body.

The essential thing is that we would provide a home, and where a home is provided for students there is no need and therefore no excuse for fraternities. With the disappearance of the fraternities disappears that social cleavage which appears wherever they are allowed. With 200 young women, 200 young men, in one common college home, they are bound to be democratic, they cannot help it, such is the constitution of youth.

Another advantage is that you would have two or more sister institutions under one common administration, which could be used for comparative educational experiments. You could have intramural games between them; you could have common prizes for them to strive after not only in athletics, but also in literary and scientific work. In fact, you could have all the good that comes from friendly rivalry.

That is the first thing that I would recommend in order to get at our students in a way that we do not now get at them: let us group them together in units of about 200 each with a dean at their head as their guide, and let them go.

There is a general culture comes from rubbing elbows with other people, which constitutes about half of what students get in college. It is accelerated if you put them together in a college home and compel them to eat together, sleep together, play together, knock against one another a hundred times a day. We don't hit them now, but if we can get them together we can hit them.

The second fault that I find with our present college is that when we do hit the students they don't seem to know

it. In other words, there is something wrong with the loading of this gun of ours. When our students escape from us—become alumni—they don't show the slightest sign, hardly a scar, of what they have come through. Well, is it any wonder? For what do we mean by our present method of teaching and examining? Do we not proclaim to our students that perfection is not only attainable but actually expected of them? We give some of them 100 per cent. in the examinations, others 95 per cent., high honor, and decorate them with watch keys when we send them out. And yet those students may not have done more than a minimum of thinking. They may have won high honors and Phi Beta Kappa by merely sitting carefully in class, taking down what the professor said, and reproducing it on the examination paper. I suppose we are all willing enough to confess our faults in that respect.

There is one slight adjustment that would make a big change in this. Let both student and teacher be given to understand that the student will be examined not on what the teacher has said and not on a textbook, but on a subject, and that the examination will not be held at the end of every week or at the end of every semester, but when he has had time to work and think, at the end at least of a year, sometimes at the end of two years, and possibly more. And, still more important, let them know that the examination will not be given by the teacher. Tell that to the teacher *and* the student, and see them both dig to prepare that boy for examination. We are, I think, the only country where the same person does the teaching and the examining for a degree. We don't allow it for our higher degrees, at least I hope no institution does—I don't know of any. For our Master's degree and for our Doctor's degree we would never think of having the candidate examined by the individual teacher who has brought him along, but for the B.A. we still adhere to high school methods of having the same person act as teacher and examiner. It would not be very hard to make this change. It is

already made in a few places. In a group like this representing so many colleges, you see that this manner of examining could be effected simply by exchanging members of one faculty with members of the faculty of another institution for the purposes of examination.

As to the grading—never give a man 100 per cent. Never write examination questions that can be answered so as to get 100 per cent. That is what makes the students think unconsciously that the whole thing is on such a low level. They are not satisfied with that kind of attainment in the things that they do for themselves. Let the examination questions be formulated in such fashion as to show the student that they are far beyond what he knows. Let them act as an incentive to him to find out more; make him wish that he could do better than he does. And then, when the papers are examined, give first grade or first class honors to a first rate mind doing first rate work. That is not a hard thing to recognize; you very seldom find it. To a second rate mind doing first class work or to a first rate mind doing second grade work, give second grade, and give nothing but a pass to all others.

These are the two changes I mentioned. If we got our students together where we could handle them *en masse* and where they could work on one another through an *esprit de corps*, and if we could reconstruct our method of teaching, examining and grading so as to show the students something more is expected of them than learning by rote, we would have gone a long way toward revolutionizing our methods of education.

One of our English visitors last year after inspecting our educational system reported that there were two things that had impressed him in America. One was the attention we give to the opinions of the students, and the other was how little we do for them. The more I think about it the more I think that is true. We are tremendously concerned about what the students wish, whereas if we know our business we ought to tell them what they want. Of

course, if what this Englishman says is true, there is a direct relation between these two peculiarities of our system. It is because we have allowed ourselves to be dragged down to the level imposed upon us by the students that our colleges are not more effective. We can make them effective only if we enlist the students' cooperation in some such way as I have outlined.

---

#### ANNUAL MEETING, JANUARY, 1928

The next annual meetings of the Association of American Colleges, the Council of Church Boards of Education, and related agencies will be held at Atlantic City, N. J., the week of January 9-14, 1928. The Chalfonte-Haddon Hall has been chosen as headquarters, but many excellent hotels will be available for guests at a wide range of prices, since this is a slack season for "America's great playground." On the other hand, the hotels of Chicago and New York are never so crowded as at this season.

The Association of American Colleges will open Thursday evening with the usual dinner session at which men of national reputation will speak, and will continue throughout the day and evening Friday and until noon Saturday, January 14. The program taking shape promises to be one of the best ever presented.

An important change will be made in the distribution of time for the week. The Council will meet Monday and Tuesday, January 9 and 10. Tuesday evening as well as the entire day Wednesday will be open for sessions of the educational associations of the several denominations. On Thursday morning several of the leading Boards of Education and their respective college groups have agreed to a joint session especially devoted to a consideration of the problems of prevocational instruction in the various phases of full-time service to the churches. Thursday afternoon, as usual, there will be a mass meeting, in a series now become notable in the religio-educational history of the country, on the relation of religion to American education.

## THE RELATIONS BETWEEN FACULTY AND STUDENTS

PRESIDENT CLARENCE C. LITTLE, The University of Michigan

My topic is open to two very different interpretations. Taken literally, I suppose it might mean a detailed study of the mothers and fathers, since they are the relations which usually stand between the faculty and the students. In fact, when Dean Effinger said that the Lord had delivered the present generation into our hands, I think he was right, and I wish the parents had done the same thing. Those of you who are parents know that the students are only loaned to us at best by the parents and that the parents haven't done quite such a good job as the Lord has in granting us a clear title.

I have also been interested in the figure of Mark Hopkins, which continually recurs in educational addresses and being a biologist I think that it may provide the first proof for the inheritance of acquired characters. This seems to be true because having sat upon a log for a long time the students appear to have caught the wood by contagion in the head and the faculty in the backbone. The net result is apparent to all of us, I think, and I think there is very interesting transmission of that peculiar localization of the wood through a great many college generations.

I don't suppose anybody will ever completely define an effective college. I suspect the definition would be like that of a perfect wife. If that particular definition was called for publicly here at the present time, we should without any question have a diplomatic response; if we called for it in private we might get an entirely different vote. Quite possibly that same thing applies to the case of the effective college. However, it is something to think about and to discuss.

I suppose there is no better measure of the success of a college than the relationship between its faculty and the students. If we were asked to focus upon one single phase of the work which we are doing which would show up the success or failure of our achievement, it would be found in that relationship. It is a relationship which varies so much that we shall only be safe if we retreat at the outset to that always sure fortress of general principles, and general statements. If we try to be too specific we shall find very quickly that we have eliminated one whole group, or several groups, of institutions from the consideration of the problem.

When relationships between faculty and students vary tremendously, as they do, in all institutions, it is a reflection of a very definite complexity of environment. When life of any kind finds itself in a simple environment, one does not find great variation in its forms of activity; there is no need for it. It is only when an environment becomes very complex that living things attempt to meet the complexity by varying up to the limit of their adaptability. That is what our colleges seem to me to be doing to-day. Surrounded by a changing civilization, they have been forced to throw out all sorts of structures which attempt to adapt themselves to these rapidly changing conditions surrounding us. That means that in order to come to any proper sense of the relation between faculty and students we must at all times and in every way possible develop tests as to the differences which exist. That will mean tests as to the variations which exist in our faculty members and tests as to the differences which exist in our student bodies. These differences are, some of them, inherent in the material itself while others are the by-products of the environment.

President Macmillan has shown how by simplifying the environment, by isolating small groups, it is easier to solve your problem. That is a perfectly sound biological principle. When nature wants to test an organism it isolates

it and watches what happens. When we want to find out the nature of our student body socially we must isolate it in smaller groups than we are now using, and when we want to find out its nature individually we must try to isolate the individual mind and find out about that.

That will mean long and arduous *research*, and it will mean research from the point of view of both faculty and students. It will also involve the recognition that they are both of them being studied in a spirit of friendship and in a spirit which has as its aim the reconciliation of their points of difference. An ultimate cooperation between them will be of very greatest value. The students have enjoyed an immunity from that type of analysis, due to their great numbers, and the faculties have largely enjoyed immunity due to the great height of mental achievement which they have reached. Neither of those conditions is fair. It is not right to leave our students in masses without attempting to find out the basis for the differences that exist, and to utilize those differences intelligently. Nor is it fair to faculty members to pretend that they are all "born free and equal," because they are not. The students will determine the truth of the latter statement even if we who are interested in administration do not.

In this matter as in the evaluation of a scientific paper, it is much more fun to correct your own mistakes than to have somebody else do it for you. On this basis, then, a study of the nature of differences in faculty members, in their point of view, in their abilities and in their success in reconciling their abilities with their achievement, will be a fair, decent thing to do from the point of view of the faculty itself.

Those of you who are interested in administration will have to develop, I imagine, "triple-plate," rhinoceros hide in order to do it. It is nevertheless one of the clear obligations that lie before us, if we are to say that we have fairly attempted to cope with the complexity of the situation with which we are faced.

Similarly, it is not going to be popular at all in the larger institutions when we begin to break the student body up into groups, to pull them out of the very pleasurable and highly indefinite environment of a city and to locate them in dormitories, smaller housing units, where we know what they are doing with their sixteen or eighteen or twenty leisure hours out of every twenty-four. It is not very logical to say that we are really educating, that is to say, "leading out" personalities when we are interested in them only in the class room. In that particular environment they do not exhibit themselves naturally, they are not "caught off their guard." Of course, I don't include those merry little occasions where the teacher catches them reading newspapers and that sort of thing—those will always occur, I hope, since they show a certain degree of human quality, but I do think that we have almost entirely ignored the vast leisure period of the student and then have been very surprised when he has used that period in a way which seems to us undesirable.

*Habit formation* has almost been forgotten in our American systems of education, and instead, really, of building up a democracy of education in our various universities, we have practically relied on a communistic form of relationship between students and faculty. There is no effort made to utilize contacts with any broad end in view. I am making rather sweeping generalities and I know that they don't apply to every institution, but in order to save time it is necessary sometimes to dogmatize, so that I hope you will excuse me if I speak in that very sweeping way.

Now what kind of a criterion can we use to test both our faculty and our students? We certainly cannot apply the same mental tests to both. I don't think that either group would vote for that. Having in mind a certain very ponderous colonel of heavy artillery who took one of the Army enlisted men's mental tests, broke five pencils and one of the commandments in the process, and made a very poor showing, I know that there would be some faculty members

who would suffer from some of the tests that are being given at the present time. As for the administrative officers, if we have learned even one lesson we certainly should steer clear of such a pitfall.

There is, however, a somewhat general term which I think has not been very much abused and which has been very helpful in analyzing the situation. That term is "opportunity." It is an indefinite term, but it means something to all of us. It has a more obvious meaning, perhaps, after considering it than it has at first glimpse.

There are five phases of opportunity that apply equally to all of us and to our faculties and to our students, and they come in a fairly logical sequence. The first is to make sure that there is a desire born in the minds of all concerned, *to hunt for opportunity*, in other words never to be wholly satisfied with the existing order of things. We criticize too great satisfaction in the students, and where it is present we lament it in the faculty. To hunt, then, for opportunity and never to stop hunting for it is the first step, as I see it, toward a measure of success and a measure of cooperation in true education.

*To know when you have found it* is the second step. These two steps are preliminary and lie at the base of the other three. There is no use hunting for opportunity if you don't know when you have found it. If you confine yourself merely to hunting and don't know when you have found opportunity, you turn into an intellectual gossip—a person who flits around from one thing to another without any sense of discovery.

If we could be sure that at the end of the first two years of college we knew which students had developed an undying desire to hunt for opportunity mentally and to recognize it when they found it, we should have material for a far better group of juniors and seniors than we have to-day. Whatever honestly is being done to-day in colleges to find out whether there has been a change in the point of view of the student, a change of this type, will serve as a

guiding star for that student both in his undergraduate days and up any degree of the educational system that you may want to lead him after that time.

The third step, after having hunted for and learned how to recognize opportunity, *is to evaluate it*, to have a basis of comparison, to separate accurately the wise from the unwise, the old from the new, the temporary from the permanent, the constructive from the destructive, in the various problems which come up mentally. That is a higher order of achievement and I believe will not be practiced by the *average* freshman or sophomore in our colleges to-day. It can, however, be practiced by the average junior if we aim the freshman and sophomore courses in such a way as to develop its foundation.

Therefore, we should *look for, recognize, and evaluate* opportunity—and *then use it*. There is no point in teaching a desire to use opportunity before you have taught the student how to look for it and find it and evaluate it. We have cases again and again of a boy or girl with abundant energy, hard workers, who have no power of discrimination whatever. They don't know what they are looking for or when they have found it, or how to place a value upon it. We have to face those three steps, as I see it, before the hard work which President Effinger has advocated, and which is an absolute necessity, is put before them. I don't say they must be developed altogether before we take that up, but these three steps will quite obviously be necessary before wise utilization of opportunity is possible.

The fifth and last step belongs to the exceptional student and to the exceptional faculty member, and that is to create opportunity for others. *If you look for, recognize, evaluate, use and finally create opportunity*, and if it becomes known that the common efforts of administration, faculty and students lie along that line, I believe that you have a basis on which you can build cooperation. Until we have that, until we find the students realizing that the faculty

are being asked to apply to their problems the same constructive, forward-looking policy which they are being asked to apply to theirs, we shall not have much real cooperation.

It is not going to be easy to do this, and yet it seems to me that therein lies life and evolution and idealism as applied to "higher" education as compared with the word "lower." If we fail to make our higher education *qualitatively* different, with more ideals that are somewhat intangible, we shall not be doing anything except carrying on an aggravated and elaborated form of high school "illness" through the college course. I think that we all realize that failure lies in that direction.

There will be three general groups of students and faculty: a lower, a medium, and a higher group—an inferior, an average, and a superior division. The shape of the curve in which they will eventually fall will depend upon the nature of the group in the particular institution under consideration. The larger the institution the nearer it will approach an ordinary curve of variation. We should treat the three groups very differently. We should look for and eliminate the lower group in a little bit more gentlemanly way than we do at present. The effort to make the first two years of college different from the last two, and the effort to arouse the search for opportunity and the recognition of opportunity in the first two years, give us a fair way of getting rid of the inferior student. Nowadays we ask the boy or girl to get on a train called "college" at the beginning of the freshman year. The train doesn't come up to a platform again and stop until they are ready for their degree. During its journey, which is at a tremendous rate of speed, various unfortunates leave the train. They do not land on their feet. They carry with them a suitcase full of family hopes and home-town gossip. When they land that suitcase breaks open and the rest of their lives may be spent in picking up the debris. Why not slow the train down at a platform half way through, to

allow those who are "car-sick" or convinced of the fact that they have an "engagement at home" that is more desirable, to leave the train at that point permanently with a receipt for having gone that far without having assaulted the conductor, or anything of that kind. We can then put back into the train the men who are capable of standing the longer, harder journey. Frankly, we haven't capitalized, we haven't used, our own system up to the limit of its ability, and I believe that that will be made one of the great steps toward recognizing the differences between students, eliminating the lower grade ones, and in separating your faculty into its proper subdivisions. We all know that there are faculty men who prefer to deal with the first two phases of those opportunity problems. We know that there are faculty members who like nothing better than to deal with uninformed and immature students and to try to arouse their interest and make them recognize their real opportunity. Those men should be brought in contact with the freshmen and the sophomores; those men should be recognized as being different from that type of faculty member who by the weight of his own intellect, by his own power, has driven deep into the field of research and who is busy pushing human knowledge further in some field or fields. The latter type of man should have his material picked for him, he should not be brought into contact with freshmen, he should be brought into contact with juniors and seniors who have passed an elimination test, whose interest has been aroused and whose desire to recognize opportunity when they see it is already admitted. Once that is done, I think we shall be able to strengthen our faculties, I think we shall be able to find some men who will bridge the two types and who can serve with both groups of faculty members. We all know of them; they are almost priceless individuals. Such a man is as "keen" to teach a freshman as he is to go into his own laboratory and do research and can do both well. That type of man is rare but he will serve as the link between the two general groups of faculty members.

It is doubtful whether we realize quite how clumsy are some of the efforts that are being made at present. I should like to speak of one or two of them before I close. One I realize will not be popularly criticized, namely the tutorial system for all students or for upper classmen. I do not at present believe in it. I think that for exceptional students it is well fitted, and that, by the way, brings me to the treatment of the middle and exceptional grades of students.

For the average student, the medium, the ordinary individual, "*use*" is the keynote. We have a right to *use* him, we have a right to *study* him, we have a right to see what his potentialities are, we have a right to consider him the type of product which will largely characterize our graduates when they go out into the world. He is our greatest problem and we have a right to move him around like the pawns in the chess game. We have a right to consider that he will always outnumber any other type of piece with which we have to play. He should be *used* intelligently and sympathetically.

The *exceptional* student should have our *cooperation*. It seems to me that between those two types of students comes the test of the tutorial system. For the exceptional student it seems to me that it is excellent. The tutorial system is whole-heartedly cooperative; it takes the student into an equal partnership, practically speaking. If he is able to keep pace with the tutor mentally he is taken in as "a member of the firm." Such a reward is quite proper. He reacts on the mind of the tutor and his own mind is in turn reacted on, and together they go further than either of them would have gone alone.

But what happens for the average student? For the average student in an American university *with the pressure of a degree looming large at the end of a four-year course*, the record of the tutor will be judged by the record of his pupils. If a majority of his pupils do not "pass" the general examination given to those who have been

tutored, he, the tutor, will be branded as at least a potential failure—he will be looked upon as undesirable. What is the result? If he is dealing with an average mind and the examination is aimed for an exceptional student, he must cram the average mind in order that that average mind may pass the exceptional examination. The net result is that the tutor becomes a glorified form of cramming device in order to protect his own record in the eyes of the administration. I don't think that the American system can receive that very obviously English graft and grow it on our stock as successfully as it could if there wasn't the four-year time limit with the degree and fixed materialistic criterion of success or failure looming very large in the immediate future. If we could "postpone" our average students as long as we wanted to, then the tutor would work as he does in England and a real advance might insure. When, however, the tutor and the pupil are tested by the general examination and the success of both is measured by the passing of that examination, it seems to me that with the poor foundation which our students frequently have "cramming" is bound to result. The *exceptional* student, I think, should be picked out of the system wherever you find him and an individual course planned for him. Students of this type will never be so large in numbers, even in the great universities, that we cannot well afford to give them individual attention and to plan their program without reference to any set rules or methods of standardization.

To sum up, in closing, then, I should say that if we criticize in a friendly sort of way, realizing that our criticism will often be wrong, but that it will always be honestly intended, both faculty and students on the basis of the way in which they approach, recognize, evaluate, use and create opportunities, we shall have gone far to build a common interest and to show them both that their problems are removed from one another—not by any great gap that can never be spanned, but simply by a very minor space of years which time most certainly will equalize. Once that

fact is recognized and used, we shall be able to expect that students will understand more sympathetically the trials and troubles of faculty men who are rigorously being held up to a type of achievement in keeping with their ability. We shall, also, I think, find more and more faculty men who realize that the only children that they leave after them mentally, in addition to whatever their own small families may be—to inherit the earth are not a *textbook* and not a lot of laboratory equipment or a few pieces of research alone, *but the living students with whom they come in contact*. That is the bridge between us and the future, and while I don't ever expect to see the figure of Mark Hopkins changed to a point where he and the student, instead of sitting on opposite ends of the log, are in the middle of the log with their arms around one another, still I do think that once in a while they might as well slide up a little bit closer, because in these days the noise of our materialistic civilization, as Dean Effinger has pointed out, makes them both slightly "hard of hearing," and to get a little closer to one another, realizing that their problems are almost identical, is, I think, the first step in the larger problem of a permanent type of cooperation.

## STUDENT RELATIONS IN A COLLEGE OF FIVE HUNDRED STUDENTS

PRESIDENT LOUIS B. HOPKINS, Wabash College

*Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen:* Some six years ago about this time I had been connected directly with educational work for approximately two or three months. I found myself on a program with Mr. Wigginton, of the American Telephone and Telegraph Company. Through some oversight I didn't get the clear understanding of exactly the title upon which I was to speak until I appeared at the meeting. Then I found that Mr. Wigginton, who had two months before come from a professorship in the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, was to speak on "Industry's Obligation to Education," and that I was to speak on "Education's Obligation to Industry." With two months' start, Mr. Wigginton and I attempted to outdo each other and committed ourselves to many details that we were not able to live up to.

To-night I find myself again scheduled to speak on personal relations in a college of 500 students when I have hardly had time to find out what a college of 500 students is like. There are certain things, it appears to me, that are applicable to an institution of 500 students as well as to an institution of 1,000 or more. I might confine most of my remarks to those and let it be understood that in the main they do apply to the college of 500 students.

During the past year I have been running around a good deal, and I see many faces here this evening of men whom I have pestered with questions—a list almost as long as that sent out to us in the form of a questionnaire not long ago. As a result of that trip I came away from the work with a very definite feeling that specific details as to what ought to be done should never be given out until one knew what

institution one was talking about, particularly with reference to the conditions and environment surrounding that institution. It is a very easy thing to say that a thing that has worked well, especially under your own eye and under your own guidance, is a thing that ought to be done, but it is perfectly evident if one thinks of a number of institutions that sometimes in one of those institutions that is the last thing that should be done instead of the first thing.

There is, in spite of all these differences, however, some common ground. It seems to me that common ground is more easily understood and more safely dealt with in terms of the point of view than in terms of specific procedures. Personal relations anywhere, as far as I can see, do involve some basis for the relationship to be effective. The people concerned must know each other. There must be some common ground on which they can meet, the relationship must be a sincere relationship, not artificial, the contact must be natural, not forced or mechanical, and the relationship itself must be profitable as well as pleasant. I believe this applies to personal relationships in education in the college as well as anywhere else.

There is, it seems to me, a more definite development of technique for providing such relationships in a few colleges with 2,000 students or over than anything with which I am familiar in the college of 500. The opportunity undoubtedly exists in the college of 500 for much closer and more intimate personal relationships than exist anywhere in the larger institutions to-day, but perhaps because it is there and because it is so easy to visualize its possibilities, less has been done administratively to bring it about in the smaller colleges. This situation in the three or four institutions to which I have referred has not come about by chance but by careful planning and constant supervision. I believe that in the college of 500 students the same conditions will only obtain when the same careful consideration has been given to the problem and the same administrative direction and encouragement used. There are

innumerable sources that the administration can utilize for building up personal contacts between administrative agents and friends of the institution and the students, and I want to enumerate some of those that seem to me likely to exist in any college of 500 or in any larger institution. First of all, there is the administration itself; second, the faculty; third, the health officers and medical department, the athletic director and the coaches; fourth, the alumni; fifth, student groups and individual students capable of doing that type of work; sixth, groups within the local community, such as the churches, professional men and business men of the community. Each one of these groups offers particularly interesting possibilities for personal contacts with students, and in each case I would like to point out that it is possible that the contact may be profitable not only for the student but for the other party whoever it is.

I am not going to attempt to-night to point out the opportunities for all of these groups, but rather I would like to take the faculty group because it seems to me most reasonable that the faculty should have intimate personal relationships with the students. Faculty contacts are natural contacts. Generally speaking, in spite of some student opinion and in spite of some faculty opinion, I believe they are profitable contacts. There is, in many particulars, a common interest between the faculty and the students already existing. Undoubtedly it is not recognized or utilized as well as it can be, and certainly there is need for these two groups knowing each other.

The opportunity for the faculty in these personal contacts can be thought of more clearly, perhaps, if we speak of it as pertaining to contacts within the class room and outside of the class room. Inside the class room there is certainly need for the faculty member knowing the students in his group. Knowing the student involves acquaintance with the previous record as far as possible, and learning as much about him in the early contacts as possible. Learning about him involves knowing something concerning his abilities and something concerning his interests.

We pay attention by necessity to that group who are failing. More and more we are paying some attention to the honor group. But if we come to know the students in the class room as well as we may with the facilities at hand to-day we will become very conscious of the fact that there are any number of men in the institution who have the ability to be in the honor group who are not there. Knowing the student involves knowing something about why he is not there and what may be done to at least add to the effort to get him nearer the position that his ability makes it possible for him to hold if he will.

Such opportunity as exists embraces the administrative technique for the assembling of the records concerning the students and making them available for the faculty. It involves such research as may be carried on especially as related to the student in his work in the college and it also involves the coordination not only of the record-keeping and the research but both of these with the administration of personal contacts between faculty and students. I find that there are some men for whom I have the profoundest regard and in whose judgment I find much that corresponds with my own judgment in other matters who say, "What is the use of all this? What is the need for it? Men have come into college and gone out of college for many, many years without all of this machinery, without all of this effort." Reference has been made to a report that was prepared as a result of this trip that I took to these fourteen institutions. In that report I did my best to state the reasons that appealed to me as constituting the need for this type of work.

I simply want to leave this one thought with you as the underlying need, perhaps, for such relationship between the faculty and students. It is a common thing to-day to hear the statement that the college of liberal arts is much more concerned with how the students think than with what they think. I am entirely in sympathy with the idea that the required work, except in the major and related

subjects, shall be completed in the first two years and the last two years left free for the major and the related subjects.

It does seem to me that it is a tremendous job if we are to concern ourselves with how the student thinks when he gets out of the institution. Therefore while I favor this provision that he shall work off the requirements in the first two years, I believe we would do well to give the student some opportunity to try his hand at thinking before he enters upon his third year of college work. Freshmen come into the college an entirely different type of individuals from the sophomores, juniors and seniors. The difference in groups and in individuals constitutes a very large part of the job of knowing students. Freshmen do not come into the institution with entirely open minds. They do not come particularly aflame with the desire to add to their learning, unfortunate as it may seem. There are all sorts of influences at work that tend to keep them from learning rather than to encourage them to learn. If they are going to get rid of some of the ignorance that they bring into the institution, if they are going to do any thinking between the time they get in and the time they graduate, they are going to need a lot of help.

There are all sorts of resistances that stand in the way of their accepting new ideas. That isn't confined to the type of people that we think of as freshmen, but it is acute for freshmen in so far as the things they learn in college contradict the things they have assumed to be true when they come. As soon as that process starts, whether it is in the freshman year or some other year, there is need for a personal relationship that will give them the lift they need to make the adjustment and keep their minds open.

Everett Dean Madding, in his work, *The Meaning of the Liberal Education*, says, "The man who strives to educate himself, and no one else can educate him, must win a certain victory over his own nature. He must learn to smile at his dear idols, and analyze his every prejudice, scrap, if

necessary, his fondest and most consoling belief, question his presupposition, and take his chances with the truth."

That, ladies and gentlemen, is a large-sized order for grown-ups. If that is the job that we are putting before the freshmen who come into our institutions, and for that matter the sophomores and juniors and seniors, it seems to me that it is our responsibility very definitely to build as well as we can build on the basis of personal relationships which will help these individuals when they begin to take their chance with the truth.

---

#### THE PLATFORM OF THE BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR LIBRARIANSHIP

The Board is most emphatically and uncompromisingly resolved that the requirements for those seeking admittance to professional education should center upon the quality of their previous liberal education. Indeed, the most crying need in the library profession to-day is probably that of *well-educated* rather than *technically-trained* workers. We need practitioners who as a matter of course have perused the "book of rules," but who have also the highly trained mind, capable of critical appraisal of both the manner and matter in the offerings of writers, the social and educational effect of the printed page and reading. The librarian must be an auditor of results translatable in terms of public good, and not a compiler of clever accounts and statistical proclamations proving nothing but public consumption.

Ours is an opportunity to guide public thinking, to mold character, to develop the understanding and power that must come from forces released from within. We librarians have much to contend with, and many pseudo-educational activities are ingeniously proffered for the promotion of success and happiness. The more reason that we should have successfully passed the severest educational tests—then we may possess a knowledge of the past and an intuition of the future. These are the sources from which flows dynamic intelligence, which should be linked with helpful forbearance.—*Adam Strohm, Chairman.*

## THE SMALL COLLEGE AND PERSONNEL PROCEDURE

DEAN RAYMOND WALTERS, Swarthmore College

The shades of a certain log, a certain boy and a certain professor have already been summoned before you at this convention. The picture, evoked as it has been to the point of triteness, nevertheless persists as a genuine symbol. Mark Hopkins represents the Happy Warrior of college teachers. He represents what the small college strives to possess in special measure: the human touch in transmitting knowledge. A precious tradition, this, in an era when the yearly increase of many a large university exceeds the total attendance of the old-time New England college.

There are, it must be said, criticisms of the small college by those who charge a failure to live up to their high tradition. It is pointed out that, with the general influx of students in the past decade, enrolments have been increased without a corresponding increase in teachers so that there are many large classes in many small colleges. Waiving further comment I leave this particular question to the consciences of the presidents and deans here assembled. I talked recently with a friend—a well-informed, able and fair man—who declared that “most small colleges are sporting laurels which withered decades ago; that they are not only sleepily unaware of modern educational practise but, in respect to personal attention to the individual student, they are leagues behind the large universities which have built up scientific personnel administration.”

Such criticism is good for our souls. We should face it and ask ourselves whether we of the small colleges are doing our full duty by our students in our personal relations with them.

As I see it, the approach to personnel procedure should be to consider first of all what we want such procedure to accomplish. This will depend, I think, upon the basic aim, the educational philosophy of the individual small college. Among various aims, let us consider two. Your college may emphasize the social and democratic purpose of education, regarding it as training for citizenship, for public and economic usefulness. Your college may, on the other hand, stress the intellectual, the scientific, the artistic, with the Greek ideal of developing the independent human personality.

Now, if the broadly democratic purpose predominates, your college will foster what we call student activities. It might well follow that your faculty will, in their personal relations with the student-body, participate in and guide those multitudinous organizations which energetic undergraduates build up and which afford a certain training for practical affairs.

For the college which has intellectual, scientific, artistic emphasis, undergraduate activities will be encouraged as a wholesome balance-wheel but will be kept distinctly secondary; and here your professors will deal with each student as an independent personality who may conceivably contribute to the cultural, the scientific, the spiritual life of his generation.

I have over-simplified, of course. It is possible for a small college to combine parts of both ideals. The matter of emphasis, however, will remain and personal relations between teachers and students must be determined as this emphasis is determined.

An outstanding personal leader is simply invaluable in education, as in the world of business and politics. There is, however, a tendency to overstress the fine saying of Emerson that an institution is the lengthened shadow of one man. Emerson also declared that every man's progress is through a succession of teachers. In a liberal arts college, where students make their acquaintance with the

diverse and conflicting schools of human thought, it is important that they have varied and balanced stimulus and guidance. For this we clearly need, not one vigorous personality, but a group of vigorous personalities. The ideal would be reached when teachers of varied views are in accord with the broad aim of their individual college and when they present this aim to the students from different personal angles. You cannot, by official action, delegate this highest of all personal relations in education to a dean, or to course advisers, or to a committee or to personnel experts. There are certain technical aspects—hour credits, quality points and that sort of thing—and certain personal problems and mental hygiene problems which can be delegated. I insist however that these are subordinate, that the vital thing is communicating to students the tone of the college, and that, for this, there is no substitute for the personal touch of your teachers. The prime difficulty is not one of procedure or methods but of getting teachers who in their scholarship, in their scholarly and human spirit, embody what you would transmit. If we have such men and women in our faculties, their influence will carry in perfectly normal and unpremeditated ways.

I have referred to certain minor but important aspects of personal relations. In these aspects the large universities are utilizing scientific personnel in an admirable manner and with fine success. You all know of the prodigious increase in enrolment in American higher institutions in the past decade, an increase in which the large universities have borne the main burden. I happen to be the annual purveyor of these statistics and I have found that the twenty-five largest universities—less than 4 per cent. of the total of 780 collegiate institutions—now give instruction to approximately 40 per cent. of all the collegiate, graduate and professional students in the United States.

As to the way in which the large universities are meeting the problems attendant upon their size President L. B. Hopkins has testified in his report on personnel procedure

at Dartmouth, Minnesota, Stanford, Iowa, Northwestern, Chicago, Michigan, Cornell, Syracuse, Columbia, Yale, Harvard, Princeton and North Carolina.

Typical of such organized procedure is that of the University of Minnesota, of which a full description was given recently in *Minnesota Chats*, by Editor T. E. Steward, who maintains that "the university sees the students in quite as important a light as their mothers and fathers do." Here are the divisions which Minnesota has developed for "the general supervision of studentship and student life."

- I. Supervision of classroom accomplishment.
- II. Supervision of student activities outside the classroom, both constructive and social.
- III. Supervision of student behavior in those cases where this becomes a matter for university attention.
- IV. Supervision of students' living conditions.
- V. Attention to the health of students.
- VI. Attention to, and help with, the knotty personal problems which from time to time are likely to confront young persons.
- VII. Encouragement for the student to take a voluntary part in activities that will strengthen him in culture, in health, in outlook, and in effective response to practical situations.
- VIII. Supervision of fraternities and sororities.

In their provision for psychologists, psychiatrists and personnel experts some of the larger institutions have taken advanced steps. For a small college to undertake a program of this scope and magnitude would be to put on the armor of Saul.

There are, however, measures of personnel procedure in large universities which can profitably be copied. I have been asked to tell what we are doing at Swarthmore College as to these and other personal relations methods.

(1) A freshman reception program. This idea, originated by President Little, of Michigan, when he was at the University of Maine, is now followed in many institutions, mostly large universities, where from three days to a week

are devoted to a program of lectures, placement tests, personal interviews and social affairs. My conviction, based on our Swarthmore experience, is that, for the small college, the chief value of the reception program is less to instruct than to create an attitude, and that the program should therefore be limited to one to three days. The attitude of the freshman toward college may, I believe, be significantly influenced when the faculty greets him before the sophomores do.

(2) My second point jumps to the seniors. The perplexity of students as to their life-work is often serious indeed. Without diverging from its liberal education ideal, the small arts college could place its undergraduates in touch with the best vocational information obtainable. Here college administrators can be profitably served by the Psychological Corporation, the Personnel Research Federation, and National Committee of Bureaus of Occupation. May I refer at this time to the Conference of Personnel Managers and College Placement Officers, to be held at the Hotel Pennsylvania, New York, January 20 to 22, when experts will discuss vocational guidance and placement, employment tests and vocational research.

Some of us are convinced that, in the psychological tests, the psychologists have developed a useful measuring-rod of human capacity in certain directions. Appreciating as we do the problems and perplexities of our students as to their life work, the maladjustments of many young graduates who are anything but square pegs in square holes, we teachers and administrators are looking hopefully to similar help from the psychologists in this field. When progress seems slow and there are apparent set-backs we ought, in all fairness to the present research workers, to remember how slowly advances came in chemistry, in physics, in other sciences and we ought to think in terms of quarter centuries and not of one year or five.

(3) Health—physical and mental. Most small colleges now have college physicians, but whether this service is

nominal or real is uncertain, I think. It ought to be real. As to mental hygiene, Professor Paterson, of Minnesota, has summarized all that may be expected in a small college at this time: "Knowledge of the more obvious symptoms of mental hygiene problems, so that those requiring the special services of a physician, a psychologist, or a psychiatrist, may be referred to the proper agencies."

And now I should like to indicate several aspects in which the small college may, by virtue of its smallness, be the ideal Alma Mater, knowing her children not as a regimented host, but one by one.

There is the social side, using the term in the broad sense. William of Wykeham's "Manners maketh Man" has never been bettered as an expression of what a code may do for the individual, and the small college has a peculiar opportunity in impressing a noble code of manners upon a generation in need of it. Deeper than this is the sense for right conduct in all human relations. The real teachers of the social code, of right conduct are those who seldom talk about them and then never priggishly, but whose lives are veritable precepts. In the small college great professors have done this and every small college should try to find and to hold the rare souls capable of it.

On a lower shelf than the foregoing is the practical guidance that deans and advisers can aspire to give. This guidance ought to be systematically arranged for. There should be a schedule of interviews with students and a few notes on what is found as to the individual's state of health, mind and scholastic progress may profitably be entered on a card from time to time.

In some institutions detailed personnel cards are used, with photographs in one corner and a multiplicity of spaces for all sorts of entries. I devised an encyclopedic form of this type myself during the war in an officers' training school of 10,000 candidate officers. There is value in having, in some central office in college, records which bring together all information that may be useful, not excluding

photographs. Common sense is needed, I think, as a check against making too much of any such system.

We call first the students who are doing best. One effect of this is to take the chill off a summons to the dean's office. It needn't mean trouble, students find. The important part, I believe, is to pay at least as much attention to the good student as to the poor one whose offenses demand it. To tell a freshman who is doing well that he should "go after" Phi Beta Kappa or Sigma Xi or Sigma Tau is to give him a stimulus that may help.

In these interviews we talk about "sealing wax and things": football, fraternity scholastic averages, slips of grammar and pronunciation, individual study plans, honors courses—anything that seems to be pertinent at the moment. I believe that this random method avoids the danger of professional patter and vain repetitions. Frequently students confide their personal troubles, knowing that nothing said in the dean's office is ever quoted as to individuals. Merely to bring out into the light problems over which they have been brooding is a relief. At Swarthmore formal counseling is done by the dean of the college, by the dean of women, by the department heads who act as course advisers, and by the college physician and director of physical education. But all of our faculty have a share in it and doubtless the most valuable counsel is given by them in utterly informal fashion.

Finally, as to the intellectual side, the aspect of education in which many good persons in our democratic land have no strong faith. They have somehow confused pedantry with scholarship. They value first-rateness in every sphere except the scholarly. In our honors courses at Swarthmore we are engaged in an effort to change this conception, among those at least with whom we deal. We are trying to show how, instead of being dull and cold and selfish, the true scholar has imagination, warm feeling and a desire to serve. You are acquainted, I think, with the plan of the Swarthmore honors courses by which students

who have done well in their first two years are allowed, during their junior and senior years, to read in some field of their choice, devoting themselves to several related subjects. It is a method which avoids the thinness of conventional college education and provides a sub-soil in which scholarship and mastery may grow.

More particularly from the viewpoint of the personal relations we are discussing, honors courses are, I believe, invaluable. They call for seminars in which groups of five or six students meet one or two professors several times each week for the reading of papers and for discussion of the prescribed study of the week. Beyond the advantage inherent in a small group is the peculiar relation between student and professor at Swarthmore due to the external examination system of the honors courses. The professor does not set the examinations; he works with the student in his preparation for examinations over the prescribed ground to be given by visiting professors from other institutions. There is thus a comradeship in a joint intellectual enterprise, a meeting of mind and heart which seem to me to be the ideal personal relationship in education.

The great test of the small college, may I suggest in closing, will come in exalting the things of the intellect and of the spirit. If we can, in our small classes and by our close touch, stimulate our young men and women to go their way themselves, to prize the highest and to strive faithfully for it, then we shall have done service as true counselors of the intellectual and spiritual life.

## PERSONNEL TECHNIQUE IN THE HANDLING OF FRESHMEN\*

DIRECTOR ADAM LEROY JONES, Columbia University

On behalf of the Committee on College Personnel Technique, I beg to present herewith the third of a series of studies of several questions connected with the problem of admitting and caring for freshman students.

In 1925 we presented a report regarding special examinations for freshmen and the placement of freshmen in their classes, as carried out in three universities. In 1926 we presented the results obtained from a questionnaire answered by 230 colleges scattered throughout the United States, dealing with these subjects and also with "freshman week." This year we have made a still more comprehensive study of the handling of freshmen in 281 colleges and universities. Our report is also in a sense a supplement to an outstanding investigation made by one of the members of our commission, President L. B. Hopkins. His report will be found in the October, 1926, number of the *Educational Record*. He made a very intensive study and survey of fourteen institutions, including the topics covered by the commission's report and a number of others. This report deals with the data in a general and preliminary way. A detailed study of many of the individual reports would be very profitable but has not yet been possible.

The committee in collecting its data used a questionnaire,\*\* trying to make it as clear and as little troublesome as possible. We tried also to avoid making it too elaborate, and whenever possible, questions were included which could be answered by "Yes" or "No." A questionnaire of this

\* Report of the Commission on College Personnel Technique.

\*\* See schedule, page 290.

type has certain obvious advantages, but some marked disadvantages. The most obvious of these results from the fact that few questions can be adequately answered by "Yes" or "No." On the whole, the results seem to be more satisfactory than those which would have been obtained by the more elaborate type of questionnaire. Eight groups of questions were included dealing with the following topics:

1. The selection of students for admission to the freshman class.
2. Faculty advisers for freshmen; their status and the conditions under which they work.
3. Survey courses for freshmen.
4. What office is responsible for the admission and discipline of freshmen.
5. The number of freshmen admitted.
6. Educational research bearing directly on freshman year.

The questionnaire was sent to nearly 400 colleges, 281 replying in time to make it practicable to include the answers in this report. A number of others have replied since.

In reply to Question 1-a, "Do you attempt the selection of students applying for admission to your freshman class on any other basis than your scholastic requirements?", 61.6 per cent. of the institutions answering replied in the affirmative, 37 per cent. replied in the negative, and 1.4 per cent. did not answer the question. The affirmatives were in a few cases qualified by the statement that additional bases of selection were employed only in the case of students in the lowest third or three-fifths of their graduating class, or of those whose scholastic qualifications were doubtful. Some of those replying in the negative stated that they did attempt to look up the character of the applicants.

Evidently a number of those replying affirmatively, as well as a few of those replying negatively, made use of

supplementary information in some cases, but not sufficiently to affect greatly the quality of the freshman class. The percentage employing supplementary means of selection for the whole freshman class would probably not exceed 60 per cent. of the colleges replying.

In reply to Question 1-b, "If entrance is dependent upon other qualities, what are those qualities and how are they measured?", more than twenty qualities are listed. It is noticeable that very little is said about how these qualities are measured. Some of them would seem to defy measurement. Of these qualities, "character" is listed by 61.8 per cent. of the institutions. Tests of various kinds, usually some sort of general intelligence test, are listed by 15.6 per cent.; "personality" by 12.7 per cent., "general ability and fitness for college" by 10.9 per cent., "health" by 10.8 per cent., "leadership" by 4.6 per cent., and "participation in school life," "possibility of service," "purpose and promise" by from two to five institutions. The following are listed by one each:

*Probable ability to profit by our particular type of institution, social-mindedness and disposition to cooperate, normal mentality, breadth of interest, general attitude, those preferring a given religious faith, desirability of home life, (just what this means with reference to admission to college is not clear), attendance, attitude toward school activities and church activities, financial situation, vague considerations impossible to define.*

The sources of supplementary information were most frequently found (in 42.8 per cent. of the cases) in statements by high school principals or other school authorities. Next in order (15 per cent.) were statements from personal references. Personal interviews were an important source of information in 12.7 per cent. of the cases. Social references, business references, personal letters from applicants, and statements from alumni or from clergymen were mentioned by from two to nine institutions. Among the sources of this supplementary information are included statements

made by the candidates. In some instances these are given on a self-estimate blank. In some the habits and attitudes of the student are inferred from answers to leading questions given in the application blank, such as the student's statement of his activities outside of the class room, his reasons for going to college, his list of reading other than academic, with comments on the books read. Some colleges seek especially students with a Christian attitude, relying on their own general judgment in each case. Some try to gain those with limited means, with character, ambition and fair ability. It is interesting to note that one institution requires recommendations as to character in the case of men, and as to personality in the case of women.

Of the twenty-seven institutions using tests of some kind, twenty-two use some form of intelligence or psychological examination. Three use an English test and one each uses a modern language test and a mathematics test; these only in doubtful cases. The most elaborate system described in the returns is the one which is employed by Stanford University. It contains elements which are used in many other places, but its system is unusually complete. It is described as follows by the officer answering the questionnaire:

Stanford selects entering students on a double basis. Our minimum requirements for admission from high school call for fifteen recommending high school units, of which at least two must be in English, satisfactory personal recommendations, and the passing of our college aptitude test. Due to limitations in numbers and the excess of eligible applicants over the number of available vacancies, acceptance is based upon competition. The factors considered and rated are:

- (1) Relative quality of high school scholarship, measured by the teacher's grades in the school courses.
- (2) Relative standing on the aptitude test, measured by the Thorndike Intelligence Examination for high school graduates.
- (3) General fitness for university work.

In the statement up to this point the system described is in force in several other institutions, but at Stanford there are certain refinements of the system described as follows:

The last consideration is measured by members of the Admission Committee who read all available information, school records, recommendations, and personal statements, and assign to each candidate a rating on a five point scale.

These three facts are given relative weights in a statement of regression equation. The best group are assured of admission; the worst candidates are rejected, and the intermediate group is given careful consideration by all members of the committee and the remaining vacancies are filled by a ballot of the committee members.

It would appear from the data submitted that the desire and endeavor to select freshmen on broader considerations than those employed formerly are very widespread, and that much of the experimenting which is going on should be more widely known and studied. The needs of different institutions are not the same but the methods which are being employed and the results which are being obtained merit thorough study.

Our next question had to do with the matter of faculty advisers for freshmen. By "faculty advisers" we mean members of the teaching staff other than administration officers such as deans and presidents.

In reply to Question 2-a, "Do you have faculty advisers for freshmen?", 74.7 per cent. of the institutions replied in the affirmative and 21 per cent. in the negative. However, taking into account the qualifications accompanying these replies it would be fairer to say that 70 per cent. actually have a general system of faculty advisers for freshmen, 19 per cent. do not, and 11 per cent. either make no answer or show by their replies that advisers function only at the registration period or in emergency or at the option of the student. One college frankly states what has been in the past and perhaps still is the actual state of affairs in many colleges, namely, that it has faculty advisers for freshmen but that they do not function.

The number of students assigned to advisers varies greatly in the different colleges. In the largest number of cases the number varies from one to ten or from eleven to

twenty, and in about one-half of the remaining cases the number of students assigned to an adviser varies from twenty-one to thirty or from thirty-one to forty. In a very few cases the numbers are very large, running from 150 up to nearly 500.

In reply to Question 2-c, "Are these advisers responsible for the making out of schedules?", approximately 50 per cent. answered in the affirmative and some 15 per cent. in addition indicated that while not fully responsible, the advisers do guide or assist the student to some extent in this matter.

In answering Question 2-d, "Do they give other educational advice?", some 80 per cent. replied definitely in the affirmative. An additional 7 per cent., or 8 per cent., indicated that such advice is given incidentally, or to some extent, or if requested by a student.

In reply to Question 2-e, "Do they give personal advice?", the answers indicate that about 70 per cent. do regularly give some personal advice, and that some 20 per cent. in addition give some advice sometimes, or if necessary, or to some extent, or at the option of the student.

In reply to Question 2-f, "Do they give vocational advice?", the replies indicate that in more than 60 per cent. of the cases the advisers give vocational advice, although often in only a limited way, or incidentally.

Evidently, as might be expected, the giving of personal advice, vocational advice, and educational advice, other than that having to do with the schedule is not very fully organized and is largely incidental or dependent upon the individual student or the individual adviser. The reply of the president of one small college may be to some extent representative of others. It is as follows: "We have no special faculty advisers for freshmen nor is there any need for such an arrangement in our type of college. We have one hundred and fifteen students and nineteen professors and instructors. This whole group lives intimately together on the college campus. Each of us knows each

student within a very short time. Our faculty meetings are frequently discussions about proper advice for individual students, all of whom all of us know. The work of our freshman year is entirely prescribed and there are no alternatives from which the freshman can choose. He does not, therefore, need educational advice until he has been here for a little time. By then we are all in a position to advise him and we do. No mechanical interviews at stated periods between faculty members and students are at all necessary. As we see it, such schemes are only necessary when the number of students or the widely distributed residences of students make impossible the kind of contact which we have. We study each freshman as an individual and give him our individual and united guidance. In so far as any formal action of the faculty toward a freshman is concerned, the officer who sees him is the dean."

Such a plan, if fully carried out, would have many advantages though one may wonder whether an occasional student might not be in the way of getting more advice than he could assimilate.

The question, "Do you have other than faculty members assigned to full or part time advising of freshmen?", brought an affirmative reply in approximately one-third of the cases. Of the ninety-seven institutions which replied in the affirmative, thirty have one such adviser, twenty-seven have two and fourteen have three. The remainder have larger numbers of advisers, the total number in some cases being as high as fifty. These advisers are usually deans or registrars or members of the personnel staff. In a few cases they are upper classmen who function as student counsellors or "big brothers." In two institutions the wives of faculty members are special advisers for freshman girls. A great variety of other officers is mentioned, in one institution or another. These include: class sponsor, college physician, commandant of cadets, director of student welfare, business manager, counsellor of women, nurse, warden, social adviser, vocational adviser and many others.

About 40 per cent. of the institutions report that students are *required* to confer with their advisers. Approximately another 40 per cent. report that students are urged or advised or encouraged to confer with their advisers, but are not required to do so except possibly at registration period or on schedules. In the case of institutions requiring students to report to their advisers, more than one-third require more than three conferences in the course of the year. Three institutions require weekly conferences; one of the three specifies that these conferences are group and not individual conferences. In many institutions the conference with the adviser is optional or on call or by special appointment. The time allotted for a single interview is in most cases not definitely fixed. Where it is fixed, the time varies from five to ten minutes to approximately one-half hour.

The replies to these questions do not indicate clearly that advisers for freshmen are on any different basis, or that they function any differently from those for other classes. A more comprehensive and thorough-going study of the whole matter of advice to students in all its phases would be very desirable and the data in hand supply a good part of the material for such a study.\*

Our next subject of inquiry had to do with "survey courses" for freshmen. In the replies to the question whether any such courses were required in the freshman year, there was evident a good deal of misunderstanding regarding the meaning of the term "survey courses." Some institutions included among such courses lectures on "How to Study," on the "Ideals of College," and so on. In framing the question it was intended that the word should apply to such courses as those in Contemporary Civilization and other general introductory courses. The question was evidently not well framed.

After eliminating the replies which were obviously given under a misunderstanding, it appears that about sixty-six

\* The Commission is now working upon this project and will present its findings at the next annual meeting.

institutions out of the 281 were giving survey courses, and several others indicated that they had such courses under consideration or were expecting to give them in the near future. Two institutions indicated that they had given them in the past but had discontinued them. Of the sixty-six institutions giving such courses forty-one reported that they were helpful in varying degrees. Some were very enthusiastic, some had found them satisfactory but not of exceptional value, and some had not had sufficient experience to justify them in giving a definite reply.

In reply to the question, "What office is responsible for the *admission of students?*", it appears that in most cases the registrar, the dean, the president, or the dean and registrar together, administer the requirements in about 65 per cent. of the cases. One or another of these officers with a committee is responsible in a number of institutions. A Director of Admissions, a University Examiner, or the Secretary's office, is responsible in a few cases. It is interesting to note that, altogether, a committee acting alone or with an administrative officer is responsible in fewer than 20 per cent. of all the institutions replying to the questionnaire. Evidently this function is discharged very generally by administrative officers.

The replies would indicate that while of the institutions answering last year slightly fewer than 25 per cent. had freshman week, more than 60 per cent. of the institutions replying this year have a freshman week program in one form or another. In general, the dean or the president, with or without the assistance of a committee, or some other administrative officer, is responsible for the program.

Last year's study of the testing program developed the fact that 73.7 per cent. of the institutions replying had some such program, although a few of them had no examination except the medical examination. The results of this year's inquiry indicate that of the larger number of institutions replying, about 65 per cent. have such a program. It is commonly in the hands of the department of education

or the department of psychology, though in many instances the dean or the registrar, or a special committee, or one or another of these in cooperation with the department in which tests are given, is in charge.

In the matter of *discipline* during the freshman year it appears that in about one-half of the colleges replying the administration of discipline is in the hands of the dean or the dean of men and the dean of women. A committee called variously "Discipline Committee," "Administrative Committee," "Advisory Committee," "Student Welfare Committee," is responsible in slightly more than 10 per cent. of the cases. In a few instances a Faculty-Student Committee is associated with an administrative officer, usually the dean. One institution replied that no particular officer is responsible for discipline during freshman year.

In reply to the question as to the *ultimate responsibility* for discipline, it appears that out of 281 institutions, the faculty is responsible in seventy-four, the president in fifty-one, the dean in thirty-six, a committee in thirty-four, the president and dean in fourteen. The Student Council or Senate is responsible in two colleges, a joint Student-Faculty Council in two, and various combinations of administrative officers in the others.

That the colleges replying to the questionnaire indicate a reasonably good representation of the colleges throughout the country, so far as registration is concerned, will be clear from the fact that of the 274 replying to the question asking the number of freshmen admitted to the college last September, three admitted fewer than fifty students, and four admitted more than 2,500. One of the last group admitted nearly 4,000 freshmen. The largest group—fifty-four colleges—admitted from 101 to 150, and the next largest, fifty-one colleges, admitted from 151 to 200 freshmen. Of the total number, 229 admitted fewer than 400 freshmen, and forty-five admitted more than that number.

Our last group of questions had to do with the types of educational research bearing directly on the freshman year,

which are now under way. Of the 281 institutions replying, thirty-seven did not answer this question and 104 replied that they were at present conducting no research on this subject; 140, or almost one-half, have under way research upon some topic bearing directly on the freshman year. In all probability many of these research enterprises are very informal, and in some they perhaps represent only a general interest in some question rather than systematic research.

The subjects being investigated by more than ten institutions are the following:

RESEARCH STUDIES	
Subject	Institutions
Investigation of orientation courses, etc.	14
Correlation between mental, psychological or intelligence tests and college grades	17
Correlation between high school and college records	12
General studies of psychological tests	18
The causes of freshman mortality	12

Other subjects listed by two or more institutions are:

- Freshman week
- Correlation between high school grades and intelligence tests
- Sectioning on basis of ability
- Methods of selecting students
- Results and improvement of advisory system
- Survey courses
- Placement tests
- Vocational guidance
- Freshman curriculum
- Probationary admission of doubtful freshmen
- Value of intelligence tests as basis for admission and classification
- Test results
- Physical examinations
- Secondary schools at which freshmen have prepared
- Personnel work with freshmen

The remaining subjects of investigation, each mentioned by one institution, may be grouped under several heads;

first, investigations having relation to tests and examinations, scholastic record and correlations. Forty topics would fall under this heading, including:

Achievement tests  
Entrance examinations  
Relation of intelligence tests and English tests  
Age of entrant, as related to performance in psychological examination and to scholastic achievement  
Class achievement and extra-curricular activities  
Correlation of effect of heredity and environment in college record  
Study of those who are not achieving according to their ability  
Study of health records in comparison with academic success and psychological standing  
Connection of outside employment with student scholarship  
Diagnostic analysis of impending failures in freshman class  
Relation of fraternity membership to scholarship  
and many others.

The second group included those having to do with personal factors. Nineteen topics were mentioned, of which some of the most interesting were the following:

Social life of the student with special reference to freshmen  
Endeavoring to follow up character of freshmen as closely as possible with a view to eliminating undesirables  
More attention to individuals of very high and very low mentality  
Ways to better the situation of non-fraternity freshmen  
Relation between interest and ability  
Relation between industry and effort on one hand and achievement on the other  
Research into character and antecedents of members of the class  
Study of background of freshmen  
Permanency of vocational choice

The third group, including eleven topics, had to do with the selection, placement in classes, and elimination of freshmen. Outstanding topics were:

Working out plan for gaining more definite information in selection of students

Proportion of girls from small high schools who made good in comparison with those who come from larger and better known institutions

Study of factors influencing success of students by geographical groups

Comparative study of entrants from private and public schools

Study of reasons for withdrawal in the past five years

The next group of topics had to do with freshman curriculum, or with preparation, or the teaching of freshmen. Eighteen topics were mentioned, including the following:

Freshman teaching (meaning no doubt the teaching of freshmen)

Value of teaching "How to Study" and "How to Read"

Study of professors' marks

Study of freshmen personnel

How to prepare the product of defective high school training for really collegiate work

"Functioning of our College"

Preparation of freshmen in English

Studying the possibility of unification of the course, especially the correlating of English with the other branches

There was also a group of miscellaneous subjects, including freshman problems, seeking information from other institutions in respect to freshmen, and some vague headings on the following order—"Such as head of Department of Education may deem wise," "Keeping track of what is going on."

The officials responsible for these researches are most frequently either the department of education, the dean, the registrar, the department of psychology, or a special committee, but the office responsible for the researches varies as much as the subjects of research.

We present this as a preliminary report. The data obtained afford basis for a great deal of additional study,

and it would undoubtedly be desirable in the course of the next year to give especial attention to a few of these topics, perhaps supplementing the information already obtained by additional inquiries addressed both to institutions which have already supplied important data and to those which have not replied.

---

### PROBLEMS OF THE FRESHMAN YEAR

In part our difficulty lies in the very nature of the transition from school to higher education. At school a boy does set tasks under constant supervision. His time in school hours and at boarding school throughout almost his whole day is apportioned for him and he follows a carefully prescribed régime. His tasks are short and definite and he is held to account for them at brief intervals. Every one who has taught a freshman course in a subject requiring the use of books dealing with large questions is aware of the fact that freshmen can read paragraphs or a few pages covering a definite point, but that they can rarely read a book; that is, they have not the habit of sustained thinking needed to grasp and hold a continuous line of thought and take in its full meaning. Their comprehension deals rather with a succession of points than with a train of thought, and yet this last is the very essence of intellectual life.

In higher education all this should be very different. The student should then reach a point where he can largely direct his own work and thought toward a distant object, with the guidance, the aid and the inspiration of mature scholars. Not otherwise will he be capable of developing his natural capacities to the utmost in his life's career, whatever it may be. The sooner a man can reach that point the better for him and the more rapid will be his intellectual progress.—*A. Lawrence Lowell.*

**COLLEGE ATHLETICS: AN OPINION\***

DEAN JOHN S. NOLLEN, Grinnell College

Your Commission on Athletics has had but one session during the past year, at which certain lines of interest were suggested for inquiry and report, with a view to contributing somewhat to the large-scale study now being made under the direction of Dr. Howard J. Savage for the Carnegie Foundation. When Dr. Savage's study has been completed, we shall all have better data on which to base recommendations for action. For what I have to say this evening on the subject of athletics, I must under the circumstances assume personal responsibility; it expresses opinions from which other members of the Commission might easily dissent.

The extent of Dr. Savage's study may appear from the following list of topics for the first volume of the report soon to appear in accordance with his own statement the other day before the American Athletic Association:

Administration, including organization and control, actual and theoretical. Schedules. Finance, including the use of budgets and reports. The relation of faculties, alumni and undergraduates to sport. The athletic relations of schools to universities and colleges. Eligibility. The work of conferences. Intercollegiate rivalry. Intramural or mass athletics. Emphasis on athletics and other extra-curricular activities. Athletics and academic standing. Training regimen. Inherited characteristics of athletes. The literature of athletics. Athletics and education in general.

\*Presented at the Thirteenth Annual Meeting of the Association of American Colleges in lieu of a report from the Commission on College Athletics. Dean Nollen was Acting Chairman of the Commission.

What will remain for the further volumes of his report I do not know.

After observing the fascinating phenomenon of collegiate athletics for many years, I have come reluctantly but positively to the conclusion that we college authorities are directly to blame for the mess we find ourselves in at the present time. In the field of physical training as in hardly any other, college administrations and faculties have been afflicted with a complication of ailments, notably with chronic myopia, astigmatism, and strabismus both divergent and *sursum vergens*. One of the consequent abnormalities of academic vision is known technically as diplopia, the pathological condition in which the patient sees two objects where there is only one. This is an inherited defect, coming down from the neoplatonic philosophy that so powerfully affected Christian theology, and becoming fully chronic in the Middle Ages. The Body a Tomb: *Soma Sema*, this famous word-play that seems to have tickled Plato's ears, was destined to play havoc with men's thinking about the universe for over two millenniums. Judging by the violent recrudescence of theological disputation in our own day, it is quite possible that other millenniums will have to pass before this demon of dualism is finally exorcised, and men everywhere are converted to a liberating faith in the unity of life.

So far as our present topic is concerned, the whole trouble harks back to the fact that modern education is based upon a school system created by men who were quite honestly committed to the neoplatonic theory that the souls of men must be saved at the expense of their bodies: a theory which is still implicit in the formal beliefs of almost all Christian churches. You have only to read Rabelais' *Gargantua and Pantagruel* to see what a pitiful mess this theory had made of education, down to the sixteenth century. But even the educators of the Renaissance did not have the sense to accept Rabelais' extraordinarily vital method of physical education, any more than his prophetic theory of

mental and vocational training. Like ourselves, they just kept on grinding their pupils through the dull routine inherited from the fathers. They did prate endlessly, in Juvenal's phrase, about a sound mind in a sound body, but we must say, in another Juvenalian phrase, that as to their actual practise it is hard not to wax satirical. Even a knowledge of the Greek and Roman games and baths had little effect upon pedagogical theory and practise. Thus, to our own day, the educational institutions of the Latin countries, though most directly descended from Greek and Roman originals, make no provision for physical education in the modern sense; the sporadic attention given traditionally to fencing and equitation was clearly inspired by military rather than pedagogical considerations.

Some of the more northern countries have done better than this, but even here the sane modern program, so clearly indicated by Rabelais four hundred years ago, has had hard sledding. Perhaps we Americans plume ourselves on being ultra-modern. Well, any middle-aged American citizen can reconstruct the entire history of college athletics in the United States from his own memory. He will recall the intolerable boredom of the gymnasium drill that alone was dignified by the name "physical culture" in our colleges only a generation ago. He will remember the rude beginnings of football, both Association and Rugby, and of other games, and will testify that these sports were long outside the pale of academic interest; that college administrators and instructors regarded them as negligible vagaries of the very young, and as certainly unrelated to any of their grave responsibilities as educators of youth. He will tell you that long after students and alumni had developed a sports program of absorbing interest to themselves and to the public, academic pundits ignored this development and held with stupid insistence to a regimen of so-called physical training that was demonstrably out of harmony with the psychology particularly of American youth, and that the said pundits were capable of obstinate objection

to the acceptance, for credit in physical training, of such interlopers as football, basketball and track, in substitution for the meaningless grind of the gymnasium. The latter had the priceless advantage of basing itself upon the traditional academic psychology of formal discipline, which was the corner-stone of the curriculum, as well as upon that philosophy of the fathers which found virtue only in disagreeable things.

Let us be honest. To the simon-pure academic mind, athletic sports, and similar activities which students find attractive, are still best described in President Wilson's phrase as side-shows. Do not we pundits have constantly on our tongues the horrible word "extra-curricular"? Evidence enough that we are still mediaevally-minded, that we still hug to our scholastic bosoms the fond delusion that we can do something for the minds of boys and girls while leaving their bodies and their social relations and their most absorbing interests on the other side of the fence.

It might, perhaps, have been otherwise. If we can imagine a forward-looking academic policy, we may play with the thought of college administrators welcoming athletic games for their great educational values, and incorporating them into the academic program. This would have meant, from the first, providing sufficient facilities and competent direction so that the entire student body might have had access to these new values. Among other things it would have meant the systematic training of leaders in this branch of education, with a zeal comparable to the assiduity actually devoted to the propagation of the cabalistic symbols Ph.D. It would surely have meant enormously greater efficiency in the education of our youth. It might have eventuated in intercollegiate games somewhat of the present type, but with the almost certain avoidance of some of the past and present maladies of this type, due to the consuming desire of students and alumni for a perpetually winning team; maladies such as the employment of ringers and touts, and of an overlarge and fantastically

overpaid coaching staff for the training of a small band of gladiators; the scouting for athletes and the direct or indirect remuneration thereof; the stupidity of the pep-meeting and the inanity of the percentage table; the evils of betting, inordinate publicity, and the thirst for victory at any price; the degradation of sport from a wholesome recreation to an exhausting form of labor, which interferes seriously with the participant's educational development; the building of stadia out of all proportion to the general academic equipment and without any relation to the athletic requirements of the student body in general.

Unfortunately, we have had no such forward-looking policy. College administrators were blind to athletic sports until under student and alumni patronage they had grown into academic nuisances, to be curbed or abated by such gingerly restrictive legislation as is usually invoked, with equal solemnity and futility, to meet any unfamiliar situation for which the ancient routine offers no ready solution. Instead of building from the bottom up, we are now reduced to pottering and patching, with results unsatisfactory to everybody. But at any rate we know by this time that we have a real problem on our hands, and that something ought to be done about it. Fortunately the outlook is not altogether discouraging. I think we shall agree with Dr. Charles W. Kennedy (National Collegiate Athletic Association, December 30, 1924) that recent years have seen a "steady development toward better conditions, coincident with the movement toward responsible university administration and control and the recognition by the university that college athletics constitute a department of university life."

It was said before this Association last year that the cure for the evils of athletics is more athletics, or athletics for a larger number. I believe it is equally true that the cure for the evils of professionalism in college athletics is more professionalism. The trouble is not that coaches are too professional; they are not professional enough. Standards

of professional competence and professional ethics grow together. The development of the alchemist into the chemist, of the astrologer into the astronomer, of the shyster into the lawyer, of the blood-letting barber into the physician and surgeon, must be duplicated, is being actually duplicated, in the evolution of the physical director. It is only when the competence and the character of this official and the dignity of his calling shall be recognized as entitling him to a place of full equality with his colleagues of the older disciplines that we shall approach a solution of our athletic problems. When we succeed in producing a breed of physical directors who are first-class educational experts, who would count it malpractise to turn out a student with an over-strained heart, who would scorn to seek victory by sharp practise, who are eager to fit their special work into the general academic program, then the athletic millennium will be measurably nearer. Perhaps by that time the coach and the community will look upon an intercollegiate contest as a fair trial of strength and skill between two well-trained teams, rather than a contest of wits between two rival coaches pulling the strings from the bench for a lot of puppets. Can one imagine an honorable professor sending in helpful suggestions to his students from the side-lines while they are passing a competitive examination? Perhaps, latest of wonders, the day will finally dawn when the Association of University Professors will send its heavy artillery into action to defend the academic tenure of an athletic director who loses his job solely because his team has made a disappointing showing in the percentage column.\*

In a larger sense, what is needed to save our colleges from the dry-rot that threatens them is a resolute campaign of extermination against the monstrous concept "extra-

\* Dr. Alonzo Stagg is authority for the arresting statement that in 120 American institutions prominent in football, each institution had averaged three and one-seventh coaches in eight years, the average tenure being two and one-fifth years.

curricular." If the college of liberal arts has any function at all, apart from furnishing agreeable club facilities for the children of the rich, it is the function of organizing the scattered material of our complex civilization into some sort of unity, and thus giving meaning and direction to the lives of the rising generation. The college cannot begin to contemplate this essential service without a practical recognition, on its own part, of the unity of life.

\* \* \* \*

### *Discussion*

*President Coleman (Reed College, Portland, Ore.):* I approve so heartily what Dean Nollen has said and fear so much that the criticism may be leveled against his paper as dealing in a non-practical way with a real situation, I think I should give such support as I can from the experience of my own college.

For fifteen years we have been putting into practice these principles. The only coaches we have, physical directors, are members of our faculty. Our student athletics are largely led by our trained student athletes, we have had no scheduled inter-collegiate athletics. We have taken no dollar for admission to athletic contests, we have given special attention by our trained physical directors to those who most needed help and have asked the trained athletes to develop pretty largely their own leadership. For fifteen years this has been done with the entire approval of the student body, the faculty and alumni.

## THE PLACE OF ART IN THE LIBERAL COLLEGE

*A Selection of the Introductory and Concluding Chapters  
from a Study in Manuscript under this Title  
Completed in June, 1926*

LURA BEAM

## I. ART AND THE COLLEGE

In December, 1925, data with regard to art instruction were collected from the catalogues of institutions belonging to the Association of American Colleges upon the theory that these 275 cases might provide the index of the status of art in higher education in the United States.

These data were arranged in the form usual in scientific studies of education, the institutions characterized and classified in lists, with enumerations, percentages, medians and the like, the paper remaining in manuscript. Translated freely into the simplest form, they summarize the situation as follows:

*No Art* A long list of institutions including some of those supposed to be educationally superior, others known to be educationally inferior, some for men and some under religious auspices retaining traces of Puritanism or Calvinism—have no work in art. This throws out 34 per cent. of the cases. The others are divided between those which have added art to the curriculum on a thoughtful or on a purely emotional basis.

*Historical Patches* In the latter group, the half-blind impulsiveness of the educator takes any fragments of the history of art point of view offered by other departments—Greek art by the Greek department, Roman art by the Latin department, Renaissance art by the history department—and without knowledge of end, setting, method or meaning lets them try to glue themselves together as an art department. Granted that this does good, the narrowness of its basis removes from serious educational consideration 16 per cent. more of the institutions.

*"Practical"  
Patches*

In "applied" art as well, the opportunist's sensitiveness seizes for the college certain elements which are convenient for public school education and in return for which certificates, fees, large enrollment and a sense of progress may be available. The state universities and teachers' colleges offer such preparation; someone living in town may have the technique or a teacher in the department of home economics or music who has taken some art courses lacks a full schedule. Such background carefully separated from any theory, produces "practical" work in basketry, china painting, stenciling, leather. Without study of each case it is impossible to say whether enamelling on tin has intellectual value when taught in a college, but if it has not 12 per cent. more of the cases are excluded.

With 62 per cent. of the cases discarded, those remaining may be divided into two groups, both characterized as on a thoughtful basis. They approach art as both theory and practice, their philosophy sometimes based on one and sometimes the other.

*Art as  
Craftsmanship*

In institutions apparently basing their work on practicum, since the theory advertised never exceeds eight semester hours, the germinating theory is that art must be useful or that it is inner expression, grows out of the unconscious, cannot be learned and must be done. This is contrary to the theories of the college and makes relatively slow progress as indicated by the status of the teachers: of 126 persons, eighty-seven are women, eighty-four have no college degree, and about sixty are instructors in rank. This group accounts for 28 per cent. more of the cases.

*Art as Liberal  
Education*

In institutions basing their work on history and theory, of which they offer from eight to fifty-six semester hours with opportunity for studio practice in every case, the theory is either that art is a part of a liberal education or that they can educate teachers and museum assistants, or that the conscious mind

in possession of the facts and the habit of learning can retain the creative impulse and later acquire the technical skill of the artist. The courses in content most common in these institutions are in the order following: (1) ancient or classical art, (2) general historical courses, (3) art appreciation and esthetics, (4) Italy and the Renaissance, (5) Mediaeval or Northern schools divided about equally between Flanders, Holland, Spain, France and Germany, (6) modern and American art. In ancient art and the general history of art there are advertised 285 semester hours, in modern art twenty-six and in American art fourteen.

The studio courses are in drawing and painting, costume design, interior decoration and in various aspects of theory in color and design. They are usually designed as laboratory courses, explaining and amplifying the history and appreciation of art but in exceptional cases they afford also the beginnings of art as self-expression. These colleges are 10 per cent. of the whole.

*College Versus National Academy* There is no evidence for thinking that the education of artists has to do with any of these methods. Of 130 National Academicians of 1924 only six had the baccalaureate degree and only six more had attended college at all. Yet there were twelve departments of art in colleges before 1870, and fifty have been added since 1900. Instead, about 8 per cent. of the college population takes a few courses and the college is pre-occupied with matters of credit, entrance requirements, material for the major, pre-requisites and illustrative material. Credit is confused but can already be fixed by precedent; from one-half to one college entrance unit in freehand drawing is accepted but no teacher pays much attention to it or to the college pre-requisites for his courses, unless he has taught them himself; some of the illustrative material listed in college catalogues has no more meaning as art than a girl's collection of favors and dance programs.

*Democratic Trend* A concrete idea of tendency may be obtained from the catalogues of Grinnell, Swarthmore, Washington University, Wells, Syracuse, Brown, Mt. Holyoke, Wellesley, Vassar, Bryn Mawr, Carleton, Milwaukee-Downer, Colorado, Williams, Elmira, New York University, Illinois Woman's, Northwestern, Stanford, Michigan, Indiana, California, and the Carnegie Institute of Technology; also from observing the interest in art in colleges for women, in institutions under the influence of Arminianism, and in colleges affiliated with good art schools and museums.

*Aristocratic Achievement* This, however, shows only the upper reaches of democratic tendency. As far as educational significance is concerned most of these might be thrown away. The kernel is in the aristocrats of the system—those who already incarnate in their experience what others are acquiring with more or less irregularity and experiment. Of institutions basing their instruction on the history of art, the most influential are Princeton and Harvard. Of those basing their instruction on education through self-expression in art, Teachers College and Newcomb College are mature types. Of the handful influencing art education, the University of Chicago expresses the norm.

*Interpretation of Present Status* Going farther into the freedom of interpretation means the brief and ugly fact that except for a few thoughtful leaders the art in our higher education is on a par with that in our parlors. It is a confused and ill-assorted litter of inheritance, imitations and authorized beauty. There is, however, no reason for expecting art to be better than the institutions or better than life. Within the college are influences stronger than any art courses: science, verbalism, organization, specialization, isolation and antagonism.

*Science* The science of education is in its devices for the mastery of tools and traits, but its art is in the interpretation of human nature and the freeing

of the individual to function through imaginative expression. The pressure of making quickly a structural standard organized for great numbers has taken us away from synthesis and from the individual. Scientific education cannot produce or nourish art until it return to the concept of education as an art form.

*Verbalism* Education is falsely verbal and, until recent times, no one in our world was encouraged to look at anything but rather to read about it out of a book. One of the tests for getting into college is the ability to do this; there is then no reason to think that the college, complaining about the inadequacy of verbal expression in which the student has had seventeen years of preparation, can function on college levels in the field of graphic expression in which the student is an infant playing with A B C's.

*Organization* The college shares the inefficiency of organizations in that its democratization is geared only to the lowest grade of intelligence and its methods in art alienate the person of taste before they gain momentum.

*Specialization* Specialization operates to professionalize taste. Instead of developing the general level of taste, higher education develops the interior decorator who furnishes the house, the advertiser to promote her and the business administration graduate to employ her.

*Isolation* An educational anomaly comes about from inability to see education and art as the same thing. The college as an art form leaves realism to the "activities" but furnishes in theory all the remaining phases expressed by catch words in the history of art; there are contemporary academic, classic and romantic cycles. Now the classicist in education who believes in the old-fashioned liberal arts program as the only true educational design can consistently teach art only as history, especially of ancient and Renaissance times, but no one else can. Yet even the college, frankly heretic in general tendency, does not recognize its own modernism when it is expressed through such media as painting, architecture or sculpture.

It protests against "modern" art as crude, quick, careless, imitative, abstract, sensual, individualistic, and untrue; it characterizes our art as failing to "express the age." The contrary may be maintained not only about the age but about education. The flights of "ultra-modern" art are the extremes of romanticism—and for every romantic artist there are two romantic educators. The romantic educator forsakes set forms to enable the individual to reach fullest self-realization. His medium is the creed of interest, the doctrine that all personality may be developed for good, that no child must be thwarted, that one subject is as good as another, that any high school graduate may enter the university, that the proper conduct of a class is initiative and argument, that faith justifies new departments, schools and degrees. This prophet has only to recognize his own voice in music, his own rhythm in dancing and his own eyesight in paintings. The gross and powerful pitcher and fruit on canvas will then appear only as another form of the project method and the repellent nude figures will be abstractions in form like those of logic and mathematics.

*Antagonism* Finally, the college is meant to hand on tradition and the artist is meant to break tradition. Art is one thing and college is another. Consequently there can be no end but only the usefulness of antagonism.

## II. INTENSIVE STUDY OF INSTITUTIONS

The generalizations following are based upon intensive studies of Newcomb College, University of Chicago, University of Washington, Oberlin, Smith and Dartmouth Colleges, made during visits ranging from a fortnight to two months in length. During the period, visits were made also to Tulane University, Trinity College (Washington, D. C.), Howard University, St. Mary Dominican (New Orleans), Mills College and University of California, the Institute for College Teachers of Art conducted by the Association of American Architects at the Art Institute of Chicago, and to

various schools, museums and galleries connected with college environment.

#### A. Significant Tendencies

##### 1. *Increased Enrollment*

Since about 1920 colleges report a change in student interest and consequently in educational development—a focus in material which has to do with man and society rather than the exact sciences. This is accompanied by increased specialization in English. From the field of literature taught as history, to art taught in the same way, means crossing only a very narrow line. Students majoring in art are everywhere increasing and many say that they came over into art out of English, their original field.

##### 2. *Lack of a Philosophy of the Arts*

This growth is a *laissez faire* process of accretion, without comprehensive plan on the part of the college. Originating piecemeal through the personal interest of a few, the arts have an uneven and specialized institutional development.

In an individual, a turning toward one art means the nucleus of an interest in three or more, but without any consistent philosophy of art. The preferences of the art student in drama, music, dancing and literature are scattered along through the centuries at inconsistent, varying and widely separated levels of excellence.

This may be true even in the field of space arts. College students majoring in "art" may have little interest in architecture and sculpture, preferring the latter according to the standards they use for pictures and looking at buildings as if only the front of them were there. Art interest appears to follow literary interest; outside a specialized field tastes in arts are likely to be conventionalized in the higher channels of popular taste except for the relatively few pupils and teachers who are or mean to be artists.

### 3. *Quality*

There was vitality and merit in every department studied. All programs are influenced by regional peculiarities and the presence or absence of art schools in the vicinity. Material to judge the quality of art departments as institutional and regional influence is not available. It is then the more necessary to judge their quality by certain achievements of point of view in their students. Can they do? Have they learned? Are they changed? Will they work? Do they think? What and how much?

Upon that principle, quality is in proportion to the degree of freedom and comprehension given the department by the college. The really mature and distinguished departments have projected themselves out of the inner consciousness of personality. In other cases the colleges have not begun with art *per se* but have devised a special subject, viz., art-as-it-can-be-taught-in-the-college.

The college atmosphere is not favorable to art in the creative sense. It is without solitude, intensively regulated, occupied with hard and definite tasks of learning, confused with such matters of group opinion as eligibility to fraternities, week-ends and trips. All that rhythm of the blood which might express itself in the rhythm of the arts is quickly externalized in sports, amusements and the mechanics of social life. Because of these and other reasons there exists a schism between those who think art is learning and those who think art is doing. An arbitrary line drawn between these theories would leave the East on one side, the West and South on the other and Chicago cut by the boundary, one-half for each side.

As a whole, the increased enrollment of art departments is guided in accordance with the college traditions of literary and scientific teaching. It is quantitatively attracted toward history, especially the history of painting. The teaching is in accordance with the student's previously acquired idiom—historical, sociological, biographical—with the addition of a humanistic and esthetic pleasure. Of

painting as a language of form, there is little attempt at interpretation except in practical courses.

The college attitude, while different from the popular attitude and from that of art critics, contains little pieces of both. It has limited contact with environment, industry, society and lower-school education—is not concerned with the national life, is not social, but personal.

### B. Teachers

#### 1. *Historians of Art*

If not in art, this group might have been teachers in such fields as literature, history, philosophy and Greek. They are connoisseurs—scholarly, cultivated, leisurely, delightful to meet, not too aggressive. All of them have done practical work, but very few continue it after student days.

They teach history of architecture, history of ornament, history of design, archeology, art of the book, as well as history of painting. They enlist colleagues from the departments of classics or history to help in the teaching of Greek and Roman art.

These men have been prepared chiefly by Princeton and Harvard. All are lecturers, delivering material solidly packed with fact, illustrated with slides, with reference reading prescribed from specific texts. Their work is hard and requires time and concentration; it is so popular with students that their courses are sometimes limited in enrollment.

At best, their material is records of social progress, biographies of originality, new material for imagination, a point of view about design. At its lower levels, it is encyclopedic and memoriter, requiring recognition and location, etc., of countless pictures and details from slides, and many facts from notes. Their ideal is the interpretation of an age through art which is its essence. Practically, they so appreciate fine technique and are so imbued with the struggle for perfection that their attitude leads students toward Greek

art of the fourth century and toward the Renaissance. In material they stop the other side of Cézanne. Interests rising in this source seem to flow away from the present: museums, antiquities, collections, libraries, postgraduate study, travel and writing focus in the past. In any contest of educational theory via words and logic, this group will always win out over other members of art faculties, because they can be articulate in terms of our well-recognized social formulae and in education and experience are able to meet the academic faculty on their own ground.

## 2. *Artists*

About one-sixth of the total number of teachers in these departments are artists in greater or less degree. They are by vocation painters, architects or craftsmen as well as teachers. The world which they can build up within an institution is small and in means though not in end seems diametrically opposite to the general work of the college. They have to an extraordinary degree the ability to preserve and to develop their own personality. They are interested in the quest for truth, preoccupied with beauty, willing to talk about speculative matters, without interest in commercial life, able to forego personal gain and almost personal comfort in favor of their ideals, but unwilling to fight for them. When they come up against a wall of uncomprehension, they will go back and go some other route rather than use their strength to fight the way through. To call them "inarticulate" as their colleagues do, does not mean anything. They are more completely articulate than their associates—but the academic world denies by its atmosphere much that they would tell and denies again the language of their message. They have peculiar and childlike wisdom and directness, are more honest than most adults and are thought to be hard to get along with. The quality which most easily distinguishes them from other people is their perceptive vitality. They get extraordinary pleasure out of seeing things; they dislike urban life, centralization,

organized force of all kinds, industrialism, power, the American desire to "get the facts," popular taste. Conversely, this places them outside the main current of our age. They have to become protestants, and have the bitterness of the defensive. There are phases of irritability in creative work and they have that too. They can see all of God and man in an art, a dish or a radiator, and this power enables them to carry within themselves the complete cycle of satisfaction. Everything is ultimate or nothing is and they can remain lovers of life. In general matters, their taste is more plastic than the norm and they are likely to be interested in new movements in music, architecture and poetry.

There is a *Zeit-Geist* in art and it is hard for the artist who received training in one era to pass into the next period. The cases of personal failure are those of inability to change style in accordance with environmental change. The fashion of the day has been away from the ideal of finished perfection and toward cruder material which leaves more to imagination and suggests future growth. Oriental art is still interesting—also Archaic Greek, Byzantine, African sculpture, primitives of all nations—Siennese rather than Florentine or Venetian painting. Extremists are impatient with painting as silly expressionism and are not interested in the art except possibly in murals. They desire only to restore the social utility associated with the Middle Age and early Renaissance periods.

Personalities of this type apparently lose something in surrendering to the college conditions and method. In the attempt to orient themselves in an environment of scientific study, they cannot have the time, money or leisure to work out their natural solutions. They therefore take the ready-made solutions which everyone understands and in which the fighting is to get the money, not to change the situation. To get into effect even the ready-made solutions is so slow and has meant such incredible labor and compromise that the artist sometimes evaluates his department in terms of

its spiritual cost rather than its actual substance and the end of his cycle of accommodation may be his colleagues' verdict that his department does not represent a living art at all.

The most impressive people in this group are not college graduates. All of them have studied abroad and their psychic area plays in space and time over a greater field than one can discover as the case of the ordinary specialist. History and some phases of international life are part of their thinking routine.

I write at length about this group numerically smallest, partly because they are thought least comprehensible, partly because I conceive of them as closer to the sources on which all others depend.

### *3. Teachers in the Field of Art Education*

There are very few of these teachers but as interpreters between art and non-art groups they have potential importance. As soon as there is any art work there arises also a clientele which wants it prescribed and standardized. There is first, the prescription from outside the college as to what shall constitute art education. In the case of Mills College, the State of California prescribes fifty semester hours as required for the certificate of prospective teachers of art graduating with the A.B. degree, and designates the names of courses and number of hours per week. The University of Chicago department in its present development does not meet the requirements for art teachers in Chicago schools.

Secondly, there is within the college the influence of officials, registrars and teachers of education who may control the work in art for public schools and recommend candidates for vacancies.

Thirdly, there is within art departments a phase frequently known as "normal training in art" and also those advocates of particular method who are committed to an approach via subject matter rather than by psychology. Fourthly, there is the group inclined to deal with the mat-

ter in terms of research: nomenclature, books, definitions, standards, pamphlets, and materials rather than children and schools. Finally, there is a limited interest in experiment, but it is in the field of elementary not of college education.

There is a feeling against teaching among students and the half a dozen most promising students of the year have said that they would not like to teach even if a scholarship made preparation possible. Except in the case of men, this is not a question of salary.

#### *4. Other Teachers of Art*

The lowest range of all groups has no character of its own but is the amanuensis for the more spirited and influential leaders. In accordance with the distribution of human activity, this is the largest group, but the least important since dependent on the policy of heads of departments. It consists of people more interested in art than in anything else, having the full routine of educational preparation—but without influence; they may be teaching history of art or drawing and painting or design, or cast or interior decoration or history of costume or color and perspective; they have contact with many students but are frequently giving the elementary courses in "principles" supposed to be disciplinary and so disliked by students that no one knows their real value; they are devotees of one or more specific methods, are inclined to be passive in educational matters and unless gifted with some avocation in the arts they fall to reading and collecting material.

#### *5. Teachers of Other Subjects*

Teachers of music, literature and writing, drama and theatre, art, dancing, architecture, psychology, sociology, education, history, religion and philosophy, registrars, vocational advisers, personnel directors and other administrative officers exert continuous influence for or against the plastic arts. Unless they are teaching some other form of

the subject, it appears relatively unconsidered and out on the fringe of thought. Teachers of English seem nearest the field, administrators, psychologists and sociologists farthest away, women usually more appreciative than men. In the unconsidered gossip of the campus academic teachers are far from plastic. The most violent strictures about changes in art forms—music since Debussy, the novel in France and Germany to-day, Whitman and Masters, Sandburg, Lindsay and Sherwood Anderson in America—come from teachers in non-art subjects. The actual status of plastic arts in the college can be gauged by the offhand conversation of members of the curriculum committee about the dance, the drama and architecture.

### C. Students

There are literally thousands of students enrolled in art departments. They appear delightful personally and very worth while. Their character seems essentially formed at an earlier period than their elders believe and it is regrettable that so much of their intellectual activity should go into minor issues of conduct. The teachers complain that students are passive intellectually and they in turn say that examinations hold them rigidly to giving back a certain bias of opinion as well as the facts. Students are courteous and appreciative of faculty but show at the same time a subtle hostility, especially in Eastern institutions.

The intent of the college in prolonging such period of dependence is nowhere more evident than in the exactness of the prescribed reading and in the gulf between the freshman-sophomore and junior-senior cycles. Three of the art departments studied usually exclude all students below the junior year.

Of those majoring in art there are three types: those who have the point of view of artists, those who teach or expect to teach, and those who are happiest in art and find that it is the way which best explains life. They have a vague vocational purpose but do not know opportunity; they are

not always clear as to why they have chosen it, and want reassurance. The remaining enrollment wants to "broaden" itself, or doesn't want to appear so stupid abroad, or just likes it. Mother wants them to take it, but Father doesn't want them to major in it. I think the motive is not finding easy courses, as non-art teachers often imply.

Students who are really saturated with art as a point of view are those who work with the hands as well as the mind. They are more curious and imaginative about it, have thought more and are more disposed to disagreement and radicalism. Some have already entered the period of disillusion. Repeated practice in creative achievement brings an earlier maturity than repetition of the learning process, but the college ignores the meaning of this phenomenon. Those who take history only appear more conservative in preference and give less evidence of a functioning precipitate. All of them hope for culture in the Matthew Arnold sense, and they make painful distinctions between beauty and ugliness. They are non-social in their interest and the intent of their application—have little idea of technical processes and almost no interest in the use of their work commercially. They are versatile in enthusiasm, but almost never interested in science. Pleasure in art is almost in inverse ratio to pleasure in extra-curricular activities. No matter how abstract the courses the student is persistently trying to translate material into action: "Do you paint?" "How does one go at it to get your kind of a job?" "Can a woman have a job and marry?" "What would you advise me to read?" "What kind of jobs are there in art beside teaching?" "How much would it cost to get a job and go on studying in New York?" "Would it be better to study in an art school than a college?" "What kind of strings are there upon scholarships?" "Would it be better to try to paint or to get a higher degree?" "Is it any use for women to try to be architects?" "What kind of a future is there in stage design?"

There is an almost unanimous belief that families, especially mothers, are the source of artistic interest and en-

couragement, that Maxfield Parrish is America's artist, that *The Green Hat* is a great book, and that poetic genius proceeds from level to level as from Edgar Guest to Robert Service to Edna St. Vincent Millay: but the quantitative median of such clues would tend merely to coincidence with popular opinion.

The teachers of art studying at the summer session of the University of Chicago are chiefly mature women who have had art institute training in their youth and are now getting the baccalaureate degree for professional reasons. They are over-busy and present an inverted phase of educational discipline, *i.e.*, learning by rote at an age supposed to be interested in creation and contemplation. Their collective answer as to why they are taking a course is that they need the credits for the degree—their real interests are the attitude of their principal toward art, how to get a better job and university acceptance of high school units in art. On the surface they are occupied with making a theology of art out of color, values, design, harmony, rhythm, and other dogma. Beneath, is a self occupied with technique, but dissatisfied, comparing his training unfavorably with that of those who have had foreign study or know art in industry, the emotional part of art as life gone long ago.

#### D. Departments of Art as Educational Units

##### 1. *Regional Variation*

In the point of view of these departments there is what Royce called "wise provincialism." The Pacific Coast and the South approach teaching from the standpoint of doing; also they feel a responsibility for the artistic development of their communities. Chicago feels a duty toward public education in the Middle West. Newcomb adds to these a hope to interpret Southern culture by means of art. Eastern departments are concerned with the place of art in the development of the individual and with perpetuating the history and tradition of art. As a whole, these departments

do not approve of each other; they vary from mild disapproval to vigorous contempt. This is partly because they view the art department as if it were isolated when it must be viewed in context. Local idiosyncrasies which appear peculiar when quoted may have had an almost organic growth out of their own environment and be needed to make a natural balance.

Of variations as expressed in painting (really regional and not dependent on difference in method), there are some: for example, the color in the annual student show at Newcomb College is full of soft harmonies—yellow, blue, green and violet—especially blue; it looks sunny. The student show at the Chicago Art Institute where some of the University staff also teach is harder in color, more violent, abounds in reds and blacks; it looks like the city and it shows the pressure of commercial usage. In Seattle, which is foggy and damp, there is little sense of pure yellow in the student exhibit—and the green is of the one tone and does not break into its component parts. At Mills College strangely exotic designs were the work of a girl from the Hawaiian Islands.

## 2. *Educational Program*

### (a) *Aim*

The aim of these departments is always stated as the provision of a phase of liberal education or education of the type suited to one kind of personality or partly these and partly the preparation of teachers. No one expects to make artists, though there are always cases of students who hope for that, and Newcomb College produces craftsmen who can support themselves after graduation.

For students electing a course or more, the object is stated as appreciation, cultivation, preparation for foreign travel. As to what freshmen bring to college, what graduates who have had no courses in art take away, what the steps of growth, there is no information and no tendency to experiment.

(b) *Content*

In an occasional school representing older theory a girl can still work for two months painting a salt and pepper set with no other work in art during the period. Accepted tendency is for courses in the history of art, practice and theory (such as design, color, perspective and mechanical drawing), though the last two are not clearly or continuously divided.

The sources of this program may be traced to one or another school of thought and practice—Germany, France and England for the chief currents; the New York Art Students' League; the Massachusetts Normal Art School; the Rhode Island School of Design; Princeton and Harvard; Ross and Dow in design; Sargent, Munsell, Cutler and Pepper in color; William Morris and his disciples in crafts; Impressionists and Post-Impressionists in painting; contemporary interest in primitives.

The philosophy of the art department is in opposition to much of that in the college setting. Anti-realistic in a world of realism, it can only play over the surface of people who take a purely literal and reasoned point of view. Attempts to get away from realism confront not only the gross paraphernalia of American life but also a generation of scientists and historians who when they were young read Zola, Flaubert and de Maupassant. Yet, students who are realists by absorption are at the same time so bookish and refined that they have no appreciation of the vulgar in its desirable meaning. They like pale colors, etchings, dark and dignified figures—delicate and inconspicuous sketches. They shrink from what they call ugliness, nothing can be boisterous or hearty, sensuousness is repellent; they loathe Rubens and the few who know Renoir are vaguely repulsed without knowing why. Santayana was pondering this habit when he said that even Keats had to turn to "the authorized beauties of the cedars of Lebanon."

(c) *Method*

From notes of attendance at about 450 class periods, it should be possible to diagnose essential differences in point of view and method in the teaching of history of art, modern painting, sculpture, and other courses. Historians have one method and artists another. To talk about the difference between learning to paint with short or long brush strokes, fixed or free palette, high or subdued key, color theory or no color theory, painting from a two-hour pose or a two weeks' pose will do no good, for these factors are only elementary method and there is no basis of comparison or control in the use of any other method.

It is impossible to be authoritative about method when so many underlying facts of the psychology of learning are unknown. The methods seem too much the ways of mature people. They involve mental concepts beyond the previous preparation of young students. In the material of art, they represent carefully built-up theories and are taught deductively. Taking the subject matter approach exclusively, it is attempted to hand on the theory in its pure state as received from the founder. This theory represents attempted solution of problems and may be barren if it anticipates experience in the problems; a student whose work in painting is too literal may be able to simplify by working in cut paper, but if there is no feeling of need for simplification the cut paper work may appear merely childish and distasteful. Elementary courses handling large groups and frequently taught by the least original members of the staff raise the most serious questions of method. With one exception, there is no evidence of the case or project methods. Of teaching by a group there are several illustrations, sometimes representing a genuine fusion in point of view and bringing notable results.

Methods to which students are used in other departments affect their judgment of art courses. A slow and Socratic method used by several gifted people stands out as enormously stimulating—the raw stuff of thought. Student

gossip, however, says that this "wastes time." Such students prefer a lecture so good that it is paralyzing to initiative. In general, methods are super-imposed, one-sided, verbal, non-experimental. They refer too frankly to the tests which are to be exacted. They ignore too completely the delicate and ill-defined values whereby appreciation shades into learning and doing.

Grave mistakes in teaching come about from inability to control mechanics; lack of clerical help, mimeographing, records, files accessible to groups, slides, books, pictures are serious handicaps nearly everywhere. Good ideas fairly well-developed fail every day through inadequate means of mechanical expression.

The college habit of letting large groups take lecture notes in a room dark enough for the showing of slides is extraordinary disregard for eyesight. Looking at pictures in a wrong and inadequate light is almost habitual. The examination of the best reproductions in color is less usual than reading about pictures known only through slides or in small black and white reproductions. This brings up the need of originals. The material needed seems various, eccentric and costly to such degree that the college has never grappled with the problem. All institutions working without originals drag in unnecessary teaching—as if those who could see were blindfolded and read only by Braille—yet there is little attempt to use museums fully, and none to direct summer work.

### *3. Place in the College*

One institution deliberately approaches fine arts as an end of education. Its work is federated in a college of the fine arts and there is special effort for a unified approach to the arts as the reality of life. For the most part, study of art is voluntary, though three or four semester hours in music or history of art or architecture or aesthetics must in exceptional colleges be taken for the degree.

Departments of art never claim to be interwoven in the college consciousness and important in the thinking of their

colleagues. Quite the contrary; they feel indifference, disapproval, suffrance—that the scientific people run everything. In one case they feel administrative backing with understanding; in another backing without understanding; in a third courtesy and tolerance without either backing or understanding and so on. The college perhaps senses that if art were really a part of its thinking a battle similar to those for science and religion would have to take place for free graphic expression.

As to the effect of art departments on the college, one can hardly tell. Disliking promotion and propaganda, art has made no headway in establishing point of view. Unassimilated even in minor matters its effect is little compared to music departments. The existence of an art department does not necessarily have any relation to landscape design, buildings, pictures, sculpture, students' rooms, house furnishings, restaurants and the ordinary routine of life. It may have function in stage design, pageants, parties, decorations for festivals, and posters, and in these connections is accepted as a force, but not assimilated.

As to non-art students, in mere conversation with them no effect is discernible. To go systematically and at wholesale about discovering the place of art in their lives and comparing it with the content of experience of art students would have necessitated methods not sanctioned by the college which pays no attention to the latter from beginning to end.

Teachers of non-art subjects who have travelled abroad talk about art in foreign galleries but pay little attention to student work. They imply when they do not say, that art is a lost planet of painting and sculpture. Directors of appointment bureaus rather frown at the desire of students to major in art, saying that they cannot find jobs for those who do not want to teach and feeling that the student wants to develop his personality more than he wants a job.

#### 4. *Evaluation*

The delightful thing about art departments is that all concerned with them appear to be happy. An attitude of eagerness and content is very evident in students majoring in art and a little of it spreads out to all the students electing art courses. No one hates art as he may economics and logic. Most of the teachers are people of personal magnetism, stamped with industry and self-discipline. They have found something satisfying in work and are fulfilled as personalities.

They preserve also the special function of non-conformists. They have room for the subjective adventure in consciousness. Their neighbors on the faculty count this against them—explaining that it is too easy to sit down and paint to please one's self without the clash of wills to round out the experience. This is not true for a moment in the ease of anyone who matters, since it would usually be easier for him to paint to please others than to please himself. Putting aside the contribution of personality and technical training in art and judging by the hard standards of educational theory, art teachers ignore certain factors quite within their control:

- (1) They know relatively little about education.
- (2) They do not know the students.
- (3) They are guiding art into channels which lead nowhere.

First: Since art is in itself a life work an artist cannot be a specialist in the field of education. Some are notable teachers and two or three by experience have learned a great deal about education. However, as matters stand, technicians claiming that education should be so and so can come in and start revolutions and art teachers have no equipment for counter charges. They may even feel convinced of error.

Second: All the individuality of the artist and his desire to preserve this freedom for other people falls to pieces before the test of teaching groups. In extreme cases he

would put Velasquez beside a primary teacher who wants to learn to draw a few pictures on the blackboard, give both the same exercises and mark the same diagrams. Every elementary school in the United States is doing better in the recognition of personality. In art courses significant tendencies in students remain undiscovered and unused.

Third: In so far as art is concerned chiefly with courses in painting and is merely historical, it leads nowhere. The culture is too foreign and imposed, too factual and not enough causal, too ignorant of industrialism and social democracy. At present it prepares for the unborn, *i.e.*, by the growth of appreciation it prepares for a cycle of achievement. It is a question whether such work can hold on after it has come out of the hands of its prophets and become popularized as college education. The tendency is to make abstract, over-refined, meticulous, remote—in which case it will pass out of the main line of student interest as the classics have and as some of the sciences show signs of passing.

Students working for the A.B. degree may know very little about art even after it has been chosen for the major subject. A junior who began history of art this year, by Christmas may be no farther along than Etruscan art and the idea that there are jobs in advertising if one does not want to teach. Except for chance information, the last few centuries barely exist and there is no background of information for discussion. It is the infancy of the process of knowing. Now this is not true in phases of life where the student has really functioned. Students are the conventionalized, urban American adult. They are curious, alert, brief, poised, skeptical; they have little precise information; never by any chance do they give questions a definite answer. "Well, on the one hand, yes; on the other hand, no." There has not been in their work enough emotional conflict to drive them to doing anything creative.

The preoccupation of faculty with subject matter rather than personality makes it clear that anyone desiring to

teach by learning more about students' tastes, knowledge and aims would feel the weight of social disapproval. Specialization which reflects this as one of its facets has other tedious aspects—but students expect it and are hard upon professors who do not have it to a high degree.

### *Conclusion*

It is impossible to talk about art departments as if they were self-determining. Their problems are those of their setting. The college tries to oppose not only tendencies in our life and public opinion but the tendency of lower education. It experiments with varied adaptations of the social environment. The English influence is being as largely adopted as the German once was. The methods adopted from big business fill the files and add to the routine of collecting data but they do not function from lack of the staff for interpretation and use. Organization is too powerful and too much respected by both faculty and students. The attempt from within the college to respond to the adverse criticism made upon it by organizations and standardizing agencies seems to be resulting in a more detailed, illiberal and rigid form of standardization than any externally imposed.

What in such circumstances may the college expect of art, or art of the college? The college may continue to expect nothing more than is here recorded until departments can carry the thinking which underlies their programs to its logical conclusion, over an extended period, with good facilities. Meanwhile, it is quite likely that they average well with the level of college achievement.

## COMMENTS BY COLLEGE OFFICERS ON THE FINE ARTS STUDY, 1926

I have read the report and was very much interested in it. I think you have covered the ground with frankness and appreciation.—*A. B. Dinwiddie, President, Tulane University.*

I would say that I read over carefully the better part of your study of the Art Department at *Newcomb College*, and feel very much gratified at the manifest sincerity and sympathy in your report.—*Pierce Putler, Dean, H. Sophie Newcomb College.*

You surely are doing a fine piece of research work and one that could not be made in any other way. For the reason that you have given so much time and study to the individual problems of each institution your final report will be, I believe, a most vital contribution to the literature of higher art education. I can find nothing to criticise and can only commend you on the very thorough and professional manner in which the two reports have been handled. I have found the outline and description of courses and subject-matter the most interesting to me, but imagine that college heads and administrators will be greatly interested in the student analyses and biographies.—*William G. Whitford, Chairman, Department of Art Education, The University of Chicago.*

I have read your report with a great deal of interest, and I am glad to commend the thoroughness of the study, and I believe the faithfulness of the picture of our work in the Art Department.—*Charles N. Cole, Dean, Oberlin College.*

May I say that I think it is a very good survey of the situation here. It makes me especially anxious to have your reports on some of the other institutions, for I am sure that in them I can find suggestions of value. I appreciate your evident insight into the characteristics of the students themselves.—*Clarence Ward, Director, Department of Fine Arts, Oberlin College.*

I think you did a good job on a very difficult theme. . . . I find little to criticise. It seems to me you have been sufficiently sympathetic and very just.—*Alfred V. Churchill, Department of Art, Smith College.*

I found your report on your visit to the University of Washington most interesting and I think that you have caught the temper of the place.—*Henry Suzzallo, President, University of Washington.*

I was greatly interested in your manuscript. In fact, it is the only thing that I have come across which gets at the point of the art problem. I am entirely in sympathy with your whole report. I don't see how it could be much closer to the truth as an article written by any one person.—*Walter F. Isaacs, Department of Art, University of Washington.*

I have little but praise for your report. You have certainly presented your readers with an extraordinary range of close and sympathetic observation. And you have managed to make it far more readable than the usual survey. Your visit has been a very constructive influence on my work.—*Herbert Ellsworth Cory, Department of Art, University of Washington.*

## APPENDIX

*A Study of Personnel Technique in the Handling of Freshmen*

Please make replies on the back or on another sheet, according to number, and mail to the Commission on College Personnel Technique, Adam Leroy Jones, Chairman, Columbia University.

1. Do you attempt the selection of students applying for admission to your freshman class on any other basis than your scholastic requirements?  
If entrance is dependent upon other qualities, what are those qualities and how are they measured?
2. Do you have faculty advisers for freshmen?  
If so, how many students are assigned to one adviser?  
Are these advisers responsible for the making out of schedules?  
Do they give other educational advice?  
Do they give personal advice?  
Do they give vocational advice?
3. Do you have other than faculty members assigned to full or part time advising of freshmen?  
If so, how many?  
What is their status?  
Are freshmen required to confer with their advisers?  
If so, how often during freshman year?  
Approximately how much time is allotted to a single interview?
4. Are any courses required in freshman year that might be classified as survey courses?  
If so, to what extent have they proved helpful in arousing the interest of the freshmen?
5. What office is responsible for the admission of students?  
What office is responsible for the freshman week program, if you have one?  
What office is responsible for the testing program, if you have placement tests for freshmen?
6. What office is responsible for discipline during freshman year?  
Does this responsibility for discipline rest ultimately in the hands of the faculty or does the disciplinary officer report in these matters directly to the president or dean?
7. How many freshmen were admitted to college this September?
8. What types of educational research bearing directly on the freshman year are under way in your institution?  
Who is responsible for such research?